**U.S. Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

Research Report 1960

Development of a Competency Model for Civil–Military Teaming

Karol G. Ross and Carol A. Thornson
Cognitive Performance Group

Michelle Wisecarver and Hannah Foldes
Personnel Decisions Research Institutes

Melinda Roberts and Brooke Schaab
U.S. Army Research Institute

Deborah A. Peluso
The Change Collaborative

Michael Prevou
Strategic Knowledge Solutions

September 2012

**U.S. Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

**Department of the Army
Deputy Chief of Staff, G1**

Authorized and approved for distribution:

BARBARA A. BLACK, Ph.D.   **MICHELLE SAMS, Ph.D.**
Research Program Manager   **Director**
Training and Leader Development
    Division

Research accomplished under contract
for the Department of the Army

Cognitive Performance Group, and
Personnel Decisions Research Institutes

Technical review by

Brian T. Crabb, U.S. Army Research Institute
Kimberly A. Metcalf, U.S. Army Research Institute

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE (dd-mm-yy) September 2012	2. REPORT TYPE Final	3. DATES COVERED (from. . . to) September 2010 – September 2011	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Development of a Competency Model for Civil–Military Teaming		5a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER W91WAW-09-D-0014	
		5b. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 633007	
6. AUTHOR(S) Karol G. Ross, Carol A. Thornson (CPG); Michelle Wisecarver, Hannah Foldes (PDRI); Melinda Roberts, Brooke Schaab (ARI); Deborah A. Peluso (Change Collaborative); Michael Prevou (SKS)		5c. PROJECT NUMBER A792	
		5d. TASK NUMBER 205	
		5e. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Cognitive Performance Group 3662 Avalon Park East Blvd, Suite 205 Orlando, FL 32828 Personnel Decisions Research Institutes, Inc. 650 Third Avenue South, Suite 1800 Minneapolis, MN 55402		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 6000 6th Street (Bldg. 1464 / Mail Stop: 5610) Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5610		10. MONITOR ACRONYM ARI	
		11. MONITOR REPORT NUMBER Research Report 1960	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES			

14. ABSTRACT *(Maximum 200 words)*:
The nature and complexities of today's military operations are such that no single organization, department, or agency has all the requisite resources, authority, or expertise to single-handedly provide an effective response. These operations require civil-military teaming (CMT). CMT involves establishing, managing, and participating in collaborations among various military, governmental, non-governmental, local national leadership and civilian agencies. In order to ensure that Army leaders are trained and developed appropriately to meet CMT requirements, it is critical to establish the competencies required for success in these environments. Research was conducted in three phases to develop requirements for successful teaming performance. The first phase involved a domain analysis and review of relevant literature to develop an initial competency model. The second phase consisted of data collection efforts to validate the preliminary model. The third phase reviewed existing training and education opportunities. Results suggest a CMT competency model that has three higher-order meta-competencies and 12 lower level competencies. Thirty-two specific decision points that present significant performance challenges during CMT are also described. Recommendations regarding further validation, training, and development of the competency model are discussed, a decision requirements table provides context for future training, and the identification of gaps in existing training and education are discussed.

15. SUBJECT TERMS civil-military teaming, civil-military operations, competency model, decision requirements					
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF			19. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	20. NUMBER OF PAGES	21. RESPONSIBLE PERSON Peggy Maloney 703-545-4225
16. REPORT Unclassified	17. ABSTRACT Unclassified	18. THIS PAGE Unclassified	Unlimited	144	

Research Report 1960

Development of a Competency Model
For Civil-Military Teaming

Karol G. Ross and Carol A. Thornson
Cognitive Performance Group

Michelle Wisecarver and Hannah Foldes
Personnel Decisions Research Institutes

Melinda Roberts and Brooke Schaab
U.S. Army Research Institute

Deborah A. Peluso
The Change Collaborative

Michael Prevou
Strategic Knowledge Solutions

Fort Leavenworth Research Unit
James W. Lussier, Chief

Army Project Number **633007A792**	**Personnel Performance** **and Training Technology**

DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPETENCY MODEL FOR CIVIL–MILITARY TEAMING

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research Requirement:

The nature and complexities of today's military operations are such that no single organization, department, or agency has all the requisite resources, authority, or expertise to single-handedly provide an effective response. As a result, modern military operations require civil-military teaming (CMT). CMT involves collaboration among military, governmental, non-governmental, local national leadership, and civilian agencies. As a part of civil-military teaming, the military must work interactively with other organizations and groups that (1) may have overlapping but divergent goals, (2) have differing organizational cultures and values, (3) lack shared training and educational experiences, and (4) operate using different lexicons. Additionally, civilian and military planning, decision-making, and execution styles are vastly different, and the command and control structure that supports a military operation is unlike that of civilian organizations. These differences combine to present significant challenges during the planning and coordination of unified actions.

In order to ensure that Army leaders are trained and developed appropriately to establish, manage, and participate in civil-military teams, it is critical to determine the competencies required for success in these environments, and to identify associated training requirements. Currently, no common set of competencies exists to define the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) that support effective CMT. This report describes research that identified a set of competencies and corresponding KSAOs for CMT, including an initial validation analysis of the competencies, the identification of critical decisions for CMT performance, and recommendations for CMT training based on these findings.

Procedure:

Research was conducted in three phases to accomplish these goals. The *first* was an initial domain analysis using open-ended questions and surveys, and review of relevant literature. This phase provided an understanding of the nature of performance in CMT and enabled the development of an initial competency model. The *second* phase consisted of qualitative data collection efforts via in-depth interviews. Extensive qualitative analysis of the interview data was conducted to validate the initial model of competencies and to identify KSAOs and behaviors underlying each of them. This analysis also resulted in an extensive set of decision requirements for effective CMT. Decision requirements refer to the specific judgments and decisions that must be made in a domain of practice to achieve stated objectives. Such decisions are often not documented in the doctrine or training literature for a domain, though they represent significant performance challenges. In the *third* phase existing training and education opportunities were reviewed and recommendations were provided for additional validation efforts and training applications based on the competencies identified in the project.

Findings:

Preliminary results suggested a CMT competency model that has three higher-order meta-competencies: Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures, Builds Partnering Relationships, and Collaborates to Solve Problems. Twelve competencies were identified that fit within those three higher-order competencies:

1. Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures
   - Understands the cultural context of situations
   - Assesses new cultural environments and adjusts appropriately (cultural agility)
   - Understands multiple perspectives
2. Builds Partnering Relationships
   - Understands capabilities of partners and systems
   - Establishes effective partnerships and teams
   - Develops positive relationships
   - Builds common ground and shared purpose
   - Manages conflict
   - Manages the flow of communication
3. Collaborates to Solve Problems
   - Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving
   - Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
   - Applies available resources and expertise

Qualitative analysis of the interview data provided initial validation evidence for the competencies in the model and identified KSAOs and behaviors underlying each of the competencies. Thirty-two dilemmas or critical decision points associated with CMT were also identified and the challenges and problem solving strategies associated with each decision/dilemma are described. To provide some understanding of the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other factors needed to handle each dilemma, the twelve competencies were linked to each dilemma/decision point. Finally, training and education requirements were reviewed and recommendations regarding further validation and training and development are discussed. Tools are provided to facilitate further identification of training gaps in existing and emerging courses and training events.

Utilization and Dissemination of Findings:

In February 2012, the final draft CMT competency model was presented at the PKSOI Stability Operations Training and Education Conference. This presentation was in response to a challenge by the Director of Training Readiness and Strategy, Office of the Secretary of Defense and co-chair of the Interagency Policy Coordination Board on Training, Exercises, Experimentation, and Education (TE3), to identify a set of the 10 key skills needed for CMT, and a set of 10 key learning objectives on which the community should focus training. The results of this research offer an initial response to the first challenge, and a foundation to respond to the second. The requirements for successful performance and the key decisions/dilemmas associated

with CMT which are identified in this effort set a clear foundation for training and development. Initial products based on the current findings can be generated to provide an exemplar approach for training the foundational competencies needed for successful teaming performance. Additionally, the decision requirements presented in Appendix F provide considerable description of the challenges associated with CMT, as well as considerations and problem solving strategies pertinent to each dilemma. This information broadens the body of knowledge on CMT and provides a foundation to develop vignettes and prototypes for training and development of military and civilian personnel. Future full validation of the model and the definition of proficiency levels can support the development of more targeted training for personnel operating at different levels of expertise, in different roles, and supporting different missions and organizational compositions.

DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPETENCY MODEL FOR CIVIL-MILITARY TEAMING

CONTENTS

CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

The complex nature of today's military operations is such that no single organization, department, or agency possesses all the requisite resources, authority, and expertise to single-handedly provide an effective response. As such, collaboration among various military, governmental, non-governmental, and civilian agencies is needed to achieve a common goal (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2008; Department of the Army, 1993). Stability Operations and many other current operations and missions therefore require civil-military teaming (CMT). According to the Joint Publication on Interagency, Intergovernmental Organization and Non-governmental Organization (NGO) Coordination During Joint Operations (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2006), the activities of a commander that involve CMT include those that "establish, maintain, influence, or exploit relations between military forces, governmental and non-governmental civilian organizations and authorities, and the civilian populace in a friendly, neutral, or hostile operational area in order to facilitate military operations, to consolidate and achieve operational U.S. objectives."

Civil-military operations typically fall under the direction of the Joint Forces Commander (JFC), who is responsible for a host of tasks to promote effective interactions among U.S. organizations (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2008). As a part of his work, the commander often coordinates activities to establish a goal-oriented, interdependent unit comprised of several different organizations. Cross-boundary and multifunctional teams, or *leader-teams* (Prevou, Veitch, & Sullivan, 2009), often are formed to accomplish a specific purpose and are typically nested within larger efforts. In contrast to traditional military teams, lines of authority within multifunctional/multi-organizational teams are not clearly demarcated and work is often accomplished through informally formed, mutually beneficial relationships. Civil-military teaming (CMT) serves a number of purposes for U.S. engagement in a region including supporting civil administration, providing foreign humanitarian assistance, providing national assistance, enhancing military effectiveness, and reducing the negative aspects of military operations on civilians (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2008; Department of the Army, 1993). Across these situations CMT can be conducted at strategic, operational, and tactical levels, as well as in joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational situations (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2008; Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2006).

Despite the importance of successful CMT, several obstacles can hinder or even derail CMT. According to Polley (2007), these obstacles include: (1) the lack of a common lexicon, which can significantly hamper communication and information exchange; (2) non-overlapping purpose, strategic goals, and vision between team-members and their respective organizations; and (3) the lack of shared training or educational experiences. Additionally, civilian and military planning, decision-making, and execution styles differ greatly (Hunt, 2010). Even among the U.S. governmental agencies and entities, different organizational cultures result in conflicting goals, policies, procedures, decision-making techniques, and processes. Moreover, the command and control (C2) structure that supports a military operation is often at odds with the structure of civilian organizations. Together these differences present significant challenges to coordinated efforts and unified actions. Adding to this complexity, civil-military teams must also contend

with a plethora of external obstacles such as ethnic and religious conflict, cultural and socioeconomic differences, terrorism and insurgencies, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international organized crime, incidental and deliberate population migration, environmental degradation, infectious diseases, and sharpening competition for, and exploitation of, dwindling natural resources (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2008).

To meet these challenges, members of civil-military teams must develop specific and targeted competencies that enable them to succeed. However, no model of competencies exists that clearly identifies and defines the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics required to support effective CMT. In order to achieve this goal, the U.S. Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI), in partnership with the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) commissioned research to identify these competencies.

Objectives

This report defines the competencies required for success in CMT, outlines knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics associated with identified competencies, and details critical decisions that are made when supporting effective CMT in the field. In addition, the report examines the extent to which identified competencies are captured in existing CMT training. The following sections of the report will describe the three phases of the project. The *first* was to conduct an initial domain analysis and review of relevant literature. This provided an understanding of the nature of performance in CMT and enabled the development of an initial competency model. The *second* phase involved a preliminary content validation of the initial model and further identification of KSAOs, behaviors, and decision requirements (i.e., the specific judgments and decisions that must be made in a domain of practice to achieve stated objectives). Such decisions are often not documented in the doctrine or training literature for a domain, though they represent significant performance challenges. The *third* phase involved a review of existing training and education opportunities with respect to the competencies identified in the project. The following sections describe the methods and analyses used for each of these phases and the subsequent findings.

Phase I: Domain Analysis

Researchers often investigate performance in areas in which they are not subject matter experts. In order to address potential problems associated with this practice, a domain analysis was undertaken at the start of a project. The purpose of the domain analysis was to frame the research area and to develop an understanding of the domain to be studied. Our approach to the domain analysis involved reviewing the literature to understand the competencies suggested by prior research in this area, interviewing a small group of experts regarding the domain, attending a key conference focused on issues surrounding training and education in the domain, conducting an informal, brief survey of the conference attendees, and then developing an initial competency model. For the purposes of identifying an initial set of competencies during the domain analysis, we defined a competency as a measurable pattern of knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) that is needed to successfully perform work roles or functions, and which differentiates performance on the job (e.g., Mirabile, 1997; Rodriguez, Patel, Bright, Gregory, & Gowing, 2002; Shippman

et al., 2000). Identifying competencies provides an organizing structure that frames the domain and emphasizes the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) that are central to successful performance in the domain of interest.

Method

Several steps were involved in developing the initial model. The project team (1) reviewed background military doctrine and other relevant research literature, (2) conducted an initial set of domain analysis interviews to collect initial competency information, and (3) conducted a brief survey to elicit competencies from a civilian and military audience. From these efforts, we developed an initial competency model.

For the first step, we identified and reviewed existing materials regarding CMT. While this project was conducted for the U. S. Army, it was important to explore the basis of success in CMT across a variety of military, U.S. government, and other organizations to determine what competencies best support effective CMT. Materials reviewed included:

- Articles published in military or government journals (e.g., Baumann, 2008; Bogart, 2006; Celeski, 2005; Cerami & Boggs, 2007; Hunt, 2010; Salmoni , Hart, McPherson, & Winn, 2010),
- Doctrinal documents such as Joint Publication 3-08 *Interagency, Intergovernmental Organization, and Non-governmental Organization Coordination During Joint Operations* (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2006), Joint Publication 3-57 *Civil-Military Operations* (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2008), the *Commander's Handbook for the Joint Interagency Coordination Group* (U.S. Joint Forces Command, March, 2007), and Field Manual 3-07 *Stability Operations* (Department of the Army, 1993),
- Existing ARI research (Ross et al., 2009), and
- Other government or academic publications, such as those from the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP) and U.S. PKSOI (2009).

The purpose of this review was to establish an understanding of the CMT context, as well as the challenges and goals associated with civil-military teaming. The review provided information on the kinds of competencies and requirements needed for effective performance in civil-military settings. This understanding was used to guide the development of the initial competency model.

A second source of information for the development of the initial competency model came from two groups of subject matter experts (SMEs). An initial set of eight interviews were conducted with personnel from PKSOI to understand the domain of CMT. The interview participants were provided by PKSOI and were members of the staff. Most of the interview participants reported significant military experience; that is, six of the eight individuals interviewed had prior military experience. Additionally, five of the participants had received some type of formal training in civil-military operations, whereas the remaining three participants had none. All of the participants, with the exception of one, had CMT experience in the field. The interviews posed open-ended questions regarding topics such as:

- Key issues or barriers that impede CMT
- Conditions that contribute to successful civil-military collaboration
- Skills/attributes of team members that contribute to CMT effectiveness
- People or organizations we should prioritize talking to during the course of this investigation

The second group of SMEs were attendees at the 2010 PKSOI Training and Education Conference. A brief survey was distributed at the conference asking participants to write down key competencies required for successful CMT. A total of 32 conference attendees provided written responses (N = 18 civilian personnel, 13 military personnel, two civilian/military personnel, and one non-identified).

Findings

Review of the literature. The literature review was extremely useful for providing background information and context about CMT, as well as suggestions for specific personal attributes relevant to competency requirements for teaming. In combination, the materials reviewed suggested that CMT is a challenging endeavor, encompassing a wide spectrum of goals and requiring more than just coordinated action. Our literature review underscored the point that in order to be successful, teams - and the individuals they comprise - must engage in synchronization. Synchronization involves "a pervasive unity of effort across the political, military, economic, and psychological spectrum" (Polley, 2007).

CMT represent a primary military instrument to synchronize military and non-military instruments of national power (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2008). Military and non-military instruments of national power refer to government organizations that can be used to exert diplomatic, informational, military, or economic power in an international situation. To be successful these operations require a unique teaming effort among individuals displaying specific competencies. Prevou et al. (2009) found that individuals in high performing *Teams of Leaders* (ToL) do the following: communicate meaningfully more often, collaborate frequently, build constructive relationships, adapt quickly to changing situations/requirements, work around bureaucracy and other obstacles, create and use an extended network, feed each other's creativity, challenge and support one another, make deliberate operating agreements, and continually assess their direction and progress. The broader literature also provided several examples of actions that are necessary in order to promote CMT, including creating an environment where there is unity of effort among actors, cooperating with all those involved, developing a shared understanding of the capabilities of the organizations involved, being able to shift perspectives to gain a more holistic understanding of the situation and the environment, having flexibility in actions and decision-making, and constantly exchanging information with fellow teammates (Department of the Army, 2008; Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2006; Ross, et al., 2009). Effectively leveraging team attributes such as the ones mentioned here enables leader-teams engaged in CMT to overcome a number of obstacles and, ideally, to synchronize action across participating organizations.

In order to overcome confusion of objectives, inadequate structure or procedures, bureaucratic processes, and personnel limitations, close and continuous coordination and

cooperation between civil and military teams is necessary. Indeed, the diversity represented by so many different organizational cultures, philosophies, goals, practices, and skills can be an important strength to leverage against the enormous task of coordination. In order to effectively integrate multiple perspectives and agendas, individuals themselves must exhibit certain diverse competencies that contribute to successful teaming. The background literature review suggested that skills and abilities related to communication, information exchange, collaboration, influence and negotiation, cross-cultural agility, situational awareness, perspective-taking, relationship building, and problem-solving are highly valuable in civil-military team settings. Moreover, knowledge about other organizations, resources, processes, and systems further serves as an important foundation for effective partnerships.

An important element of developing the initial competency model was to examine other military or government competency models for competency labels and definitions that could be used and adapted for the present model. Relevant competencies in these models were identified based on themes derived from the SME interviews, survey, and the background literature review conducted for the current project. The following models proved helpful in developing an initial list of CMT competencies and definitions: Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Senior Executive Service (SES) competency model, Joint Special Operations Forces (SOF) competency model, Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) Senior Leader competency model, U.S. Air Force (USAF) Leadership Competencies, and the Navy Leadership Competency Model (NLCM). The Army Leader Development Strategy (ALDS) was also consulted because it specifically highlights the need for Army leaders to partner closely with the JIIM teammates. This document does not describe a competency model per se. However, it does articulate key leader characteristics and attributes the Army should foster in anticipation of the future operational environment. Similarly, Ross et al.'s (2009) description of training themes for JIIM operations was highly informative for developing several CMT competencies. Overall, there appeared to be considerable overlap among sources regarding the competencies essential to CMT.

Domain analysis interviews and survey. In conjunction with the literature review we examined results from the interviews and surveys to identify areas of convergence and divergence. The most frequently mentioned responses from both the initial interviews and the conference survey included the following: teamwork/ability to work with others, understanding organizational functions, cultural awareness/sensitivity, domain knowledge, leadership skills, planning skills, and unity of effort/command. While subjects were asked to list key competencies required for civil-military teaming, many of the responses did not fall within the definition established at the start of the project. Instead participants included components of competencies (i.e., negotiation skills, communication skills, and knowledge about other agencies), as well as desired end states associated with civil-military teaming (i.e., unity of effort/command). This data was carefully analyzed for information which could inform the development of the initial competency model. In cases where meaning and intent were unclear, the data was discarded.

Participants in the domain analysis interviews at PKSOI also identified a variety of obstacles to CMT. The following were among the most frequently mentioned hurdles to successful teaming: cultural differences (i.e., ethnic and organizational culture), language differences, lack of familiarity/understanding between military and civilian organizations, and lack of unity of effort. These barriers can inform our understanding of the KSAOs required to

succeed in CMT by suggesting that KSAOs that ameliorate these hurdles would lead to success in the domain. However, more information is needed to establish a comprehensive set of obstacles to civil-military teaming.

Identification of a competency model. The project team reviewed the lists of KSAOs identified in both the literature reviews and the initial interviews and survey, and content analyzed them to form groups of related KSAOs. This process was highly iterative and required making judgments based on the KSAOs identified thus far, as well as our knowledge of what individuals are required to do in CMT. The compiled KSAO list was reviewed multiple times, and similar KSAOs were combined to form an initial list of 17 competencies. Seven members of the research team then met to discuss the 17 competencies identified, areas of overlap among them, and further combinations based on overlap. Following this discussion, the list was subsequently edited down to a set of 12 competencies that demonstrated a minimum amount of overlap.

This list of 12 competencies was next reviewed to determine whether any content themes would emerge that would identify a higher-order structure for the competencies (i.e., meta-competencies). The purpose of meta-competencies is to organize the competencies into themes that describe key requirements in the domain in question. Three meta-competencies were identified for CMT: (1) Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures, (2) Builds Partnering Relationships, and (3) Collaborates to Solve Problems. The proposed model is presented in Table 1, and an expanded version of the initial competency model that includes definitions can be found in Appendix A.

The development of this initial model served as a hypothesis of the competencies that were related to success in CMT. In the next phase, we conducted in-depth interviews, capturing detailed information regarding KSAOs, behaviors, and critical decisions and judgments that must be addressed by practitioners to be successful in the civil-military context. Our goal was to examine the validity of the initial competency model by comparing the competencies identified in the initial model to those identified in the in-depth interviews, and to use the information from the in-depth interviews to capture additional KSAOs and behavioral indicators that would add breadth and depth to the competency model. This process, Phase II of the research project, is described next.

Table 1

Initial Civil-Military Teaming Competency Model

Meta-Competency		Competency
Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures	1	Understands the cultural context of situations
	2	Assesses new cultural environments and adjusts appropriately (cultural agility)
	3	Understands multiple perspectives
Builds Partnering Relationships	4	Understands capabilities of partners and systems
	5	Establishes effective partnerships and teams
	6	Develops positive relationships
	7	Builds common ground and shared purpose
	8	Manages conflict
	9	Manages the flow of communication
Collaborates to Solve Problems	10	Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving
	11	Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
	12	Applies available resources and expertise

Phase II: Validation and KSAO Identification

Method

Data was collected for Phase II using a critical-incident based approach. Our goal was to understand the experiences of practitioners, the decisions and dilemmas faced during civil-military teaming, and the essential competencies, KSAOs, and behaviors needed by practitioners. Specifically, individual, semi-structured interviews were conducted in order to (1) validate the content of the preliminary competency model, (2) derive the KSAOs and behaviors underlying the competencies, and (3) explore the decisions, dilemmas, and judgments encountered in the context of CMT. Semi-structured interviews are ideal for these purposes because, in any complex domain, experts are often unable to articulate the processes involved in critical decision-making or complex problem-solving. Experts in any field tend to integrate knowledge and experiences to such a degree that they are often unaware of the cues or factors they consider

in making critical decisions and at times do not perceive themselves as making decisions at all. If only direct, de-contextualized interview questions about performance are used, as is often the case in job analysis, it becomes impossible for analysts to delve beneath the surface and uncover *how* performance is achieved in context.

Conversely, semi-structured interviews that focus on specific, lived experiences reveal expertise by deconstructing surface-level perceptions of issues and challenges. The analysis of such interviews provides a better description of the cognitive challenges to performance, as well as the strategies and knowledge used to meet these challenges. By exploring participants' lived experiences we uncovered the many factors and challenges experts consider in making judgments and decisions in the context of forming, joining, and participating in civil-military partnerships. Such analysis assists the development of more targeted training, which can better facilitate real-world, authentic learning that transfers upon deployment to the field.

Participants. We conducted a total of 19 interviews with seven military participants and 12 civilians. Most of the civilian participants also had prior military experience (n = 8), with half having served at least 20 years in the military. Three females and 16 males were interviewed - their ages ranged from 36 to 70. All had on-the-ground experience working in civil-military teams within the last year, as well as extensive experiences requiring them to make critical judgments and decisions that directly impacted team performance. All participants were engaged in CMT for a significant amount of time, and, therefore, had the opportunity to observe the consequences of their actions at the personal and organizational levels. Following the guideline set out by PKSOI at the project kickoff meeting, participants were experienced at both the tactical, as well as the operational levels of performance. The table in Appendix B provides a list of the affiliations and technical specialties of the participants.

Procedure. The interviews were based on the Critical Decision Method (see Appendix C for the detailed protocol) (Crandall, Klein, & Hoffman, 2006). The Critical Decision Method interview (CDM) is a cognitive task analysis method which employs a semi-structured technique for eliciting knowledge from specific events that challenge a person's expertise. Via recollection of a specific incident as the starting point, CDM uses focused probes to elicit the details of each incident from the interviewee. In the present investigation, the types of information sought included the following:

- Goals that were considered during the incident
- Options that were generated, evaluated, and eventually selected
- Contextual elements associated with the incident
- Situational assessment factors specific to particular decisions
- Challenges to performance
- Strategies for success

Before the start of each interview, the team also collected demographic information as well as information to inform a Task Diagram (Militello & Hutton, 1998). The Task Diagram included the specific task requirements of CMT during the most recent deployment. In some cases the interview team incorporated a variation of the "Knowledge Audit" (Militello & Hutton,

1998) in which several examples were gathered to aid in understanding the key events that revealed important KSAOs, behaviors, and decision requirements.

Analyses

The analysis process was divided into two primary analyses, which were conducted simultaneously by the research team. These analyses consisted of a Competency Analysis and a Decision Requirements Analysis. The specific procedures for each type of analysis are outlined below.

Competency Analysis. The competency analysis began with the initial competency model. To facilitate and guide this analysis, the behavioral definitions developed in the initial model were divided into the KSAOs and behaviors underlying each of the competencies. We expanded the initial model by incorporating KSAOs and behaviors from a related competency analysis conducted by NASA researchers on teaming operations (Schmitt, 2008a; 2008b). Together, these documents offered a detailed initial model upon which to base the competency analysis.

The team used a multiple sweeps approach to analyze the data; that is, each member of the team independently reviewed each interview transcript several times to extract the data. The goal of each sweep was to identify KSAOs and behaviors exemplified by each participant, which underlie competencies associated with civil-military teaming. Supporting data (i.e., direct quotes) were also included. Researchers were guided by the following definitions in coding the data:

- *Knowledge* - the body of knowledge or information that is necessary for performance
- *Skill* - the means by which one is able to perform operational tasks; how one executes a particular set of knowledge, as developed generally and in-context, as acquired through practice and training
- *Ability* - an underlying capability that facilitates task performance
- *Attitude* - an underlying thought or view that facilitates task performance
- *Behavioral Indicators* - behaviors that exemplify the expression of each competency
- *Supporting Data* (i.e., direct quotes) - data that exemplify each behavioral indicator

A separate coding form for each participant's transcript was used to document relevant competencies, KSAOs, behaviors, and supporting data. The goal of this analysis was to determine whether additional competencies were suggested by the Phase II data collection and whether all data extracted from the second set of interviews fit within the initial set of competencies. On each coding form the team member noted which competencies and underlying KSAOs and behaviors were found in the Phase II interview data, as well as the frequency count of each competency across interview data.

Decision Requirements Analysis. The interview data also served as the basis for a decision requirements analysis. Decision requirements analysis is a qualitative process whereby critical incidents are reviewed in order to extract the specific tasks participants engage in, the dilemmas they face, and the decisions they make. The cognitive requirements that are documented in a Decision Requirements Table (DRT) include the following:

- *Decisions/Dilemmas* – each of the major decisions, dilemmas, or judgments encountered
- *Challenges* – the reasons each decision, dilemma, or judgment was (or could have been) difficult, especially for novices
- *Factors* – the relevant information or variables that may be considered by the decision maker, including perceptions of the other actors in the situation
- *Strategies* – the processes or means used to make each decision or judgment, or to solve each dilemma

Members of the analysis team reviewed each interview transcript multiple times to extract the various components. Team members were encouraged to use phrases or terms from interview participants when possible. This strategy allowed researchers to maintain the essence of the interviews as they were experienced by the interviewer, rather than rephrase and potentially change the meaning of the data. The first sweep of each transcript was used to identify the decisions, judgments, or dilemmas the participant encountered in the context of CMT. The second sweep identified the factors considered and the challenges inherent in solving each dilemma or arriving at each decision. The third sweep focused on the strategies or specific actions taken to solve the dilemma or to make the decision. The resulting Decision Requirements Table captured key challenges, as well as cognitive elements (i.e., strategies and background factors) that surrounded the critical decisions or dilemmas associated with civil-military teaming (see Appendix F). This information is summarized in context, offering a rich, complete, and authentic description of the domain upon which to base training or other types of interventions.

Findings

The results of the Phase II competency analysis and decision analysis support the validity of the initial competency model and provide a rich database of additional KSAOs, behaviors and decision scenarios and factors for civil-military teaming.

Competency Analysis. The purpose of Phase II competency analysis was to verify and refine the initial competency model. Review of Phase II interview transcripts provided support for the initial 12 competencies. Specifically, all KSAOs and behaviors identified in Phase II interview transcripts fit within the initial competency model and thus no new groups of KSAOs (i.e., no new competencies) were identified during Phase II analysis. Additionally, there was little need to refine the initial model since participants in Phase II interviews identified KSAOs and behaviors for every competency in the original model. As a result, all initial competencies were retained. The only revision to the initial model was the elimination of any KSAO or behavior that was not corroborated by interview data. That is, only those KSAOs and behaviors that were identified and documented in interview data appear in the finalized CMT competency model. The result is a competency model that retains all of the originally identified competencies and provides KSAOs and behaviors for each competency which reflect the experiences of advanced level practitioners. The final draft model is presented in Appendix E.

A frequency distribution was created for each of the 12 competencies in the initial model to indicate how often the competency was identified in the Phase II data set. The frequency with which each competency (C1 through C12) appeared and a description of the results for each competency are presented in Appendix D. The first competency, *Understands the cultural context of situations,* was the most-frequently validated competency. It was demonstrated 34 times across participants. Competency 4, *Understands capabilities of partners and systems*, tied for the second most validated competency, and was represented a total of 28 times across the interviews. Competency 5, *Establishes effective partnerships and teams*, was also represented a total of 28 times across the 19 interviews.

Of the three meta-competencies (see Table 1), Builds Partnering Relationships was represented a total of 123 times across participants, thus a majority of responses fell under this meta-competency. Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures was the second most frequently found meta-competency in the data. Finally, Collaborates to Solve Problems was demonstrated 52 times, making it the least cited of the three meta-competencies.

Decision Requirements Analysis. In order to increase the usefulness of the decision analysis output—for stakeholders as well as training developers—our analysis team integrated the Decision Requirements Tables (DRTs) constructed for each participant into a single document. As a result, items seen on the DRT reflect the view of both military and civilian personnel. In constructing the DRT, we examined the components of each of the decisions/dilemmas, and found common performance themes. The themes that were generated from the data were those types of tasks or activities that were encountered most often by participants in CMT. Nine specific Tasks/Activities resulted: (1) Build and Manage Relationships; (2) Manage Programs and Projects; (3) Align and Integrate Operations; (4) Determine Roles and Responsibilities; (5) Align Goals; (6) Educate Partners; (7) Create Integrated Civil-Military Team; (8) Measure Success; and (9) Manage U.S. Presence. These tasks/activities were used to group the decisions/dilemmas encountered by the participants, as well as the challenges they faced, the factors they considered, and the strategies they used for each decision or dilemma.

As the final step, the analysis team conducted a crosswalk to tie the integrated DRT to the Competency Model. The specific competencies that facilitate addressing each decision/dilemma are noted in the last column of the DRT (see Appendix F). Linking the critical decisions to the competencies supports the development of CMT training. The CMT Competency Model and the Decision Requirements Table can ensure that training targets competencies, KSAOs, and behaviors within the context of the decisions and dilemmas relevant to teaming activities.

Comparison of the Model to Other Key CMT Studies. Finally, during the course of the project, several studies were identified that were believed to address relevant CMT competencies. At the request of PKSOI, a comparison was conducted to determine convergences and divergences between our draft competency model and findings from other efforts. The goal of the comparison was to build consensus among prior work and to identify potential gaps in our initial model. The documents identified for inclusion in this review are as follows.

1. Developing U.S. Army officers' capabilities for joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational environments (Markel et al., 2011).
2. Interagency Teaming to Counter Irregular Threats Handbook (Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory [JHU/APL], 2009).
3. Civilian Response Corps Functional Essential Task List (Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization [S/CRS], February, 2011).
4. Building Partner Capacity: Individual Training Line of Effort Action Plan (Department of the Army, April, 2011).
5. U.S. Army Leadership Field Manual 6-22 (Headquarters Department of the Army, October, 2006).

Among these studies a variety of approaches were used to identify factors associated with civil-military teaming (i.e., identification of best practices, skills, competencies, etc.). Note that comparisons were limited by the level of detail provided across the various studies, as well as the way in which factors associated with CMT were described. A comparison table was constructed for each of the studies which is summarized in this section and can be viewed in further detail at Appendix G.

Markel et al. (2011) Comparison. The primary purpose of the extensive Markel et al. (2011) study was to identify the KSAs needed for successful operations in JIIM domains, as well as the different types of experiences associated with developing those KSAs. The researchers conducted 41 interviews and 12 focus groups, which resulted in 900 observations of KSAOs in JIIM environments. Interestingly, the report accorded strong importance to input from one participant who indicated that the most important element of success in multinational environments was to realize that one is in a different environment with different dynamics, which could require different behaviors. This flexibility in response to different environments was not listed as one of the top five KSAs, but is clearly vital to choosing and applying successful behaviors in circumstances that cross organizational and cultural boundaries.

Following aggregation of the KSAs, the authors identified 23 knowledge areas, 21 skills, and six abilities required for success in JIIM domains. The five most frequently mentioned KSAs

were: (1) general interpersonal skills, (2) knowledge of other government agencies' capabilities, culture, and processes, (3) communication skills, (4) conflict resolution and negotiation skills, and (5) knowledge of other services' capabilities, culture, and processes. Participants indicated that KSAs related to "people skills" were more important than those related to domain knowledge. According to participants, "skills in establishing relationships, communication, and in negotiating with individuals from other organizations and influencing them largely sufficed for achieving success in a JIIM environment" (Markel, et al., 2011, p. 25). For interagency performance, 88% of observations identified "understanding other agencies' culture, capabilities, and processes" as important. Results of the Markel et al. comparison suggest that different combinations of KSAs and knowledge are required at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels of performance. For example, critical thinking and analytical skills were cited as more important at strategic level operations, whereas communication skills were deemed equally important across all levels.

Overall, the CMT competency model generally provides the framework or structure for the CMT domain, while the Markel et al. study provides convergent details for key KSA building blocks in the competency model. For example, the CMT competency *Establishes effective partnerships* involves the ability to build and maintain relationships (i.e., Markel et al.'s general interpersonal skills), while the CMT competency *Builds common ground and shared purpose* includes the ability to accumulate and present facts, assumptions, and conclusions in an orderly manner (i.e., Markel et al.'s communication skills). As shown in the table provided in Appendix G, the highlighted KSAs from the Markel et al. (2011) study converge with 10 of the 12 competencies in our competency model. The two exceptions are C11 *Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals*, and C12 *Applies available resources and expertise*.

Johns Hopkins Comparison. The JHU/APL (2009) handbook identified the top ten best practices in interagency teaming efforts. The practices are as follow:

- Get the right people on the team.
- Establish good external communications
- Practice cross-cultural communications
- Keep good records
- Understand and leverage capabilities and expertise
- Provide adequate resources
- Manage resources effectively
- Break down barriers to information sharing
- Tailor leadership style to the networked team
- Establish personal working relationships

The names of the practices may not immediately suggest a connection to the current model. However, when the descriptions of each practice were compared to our competencies (see Appendix G), we were able to link competencies to each of the ten practices.

As with the Markel et al. (2011) comparison, our comparison with the Johns Hopkins study suggests a high degree of convergence in the type of factors that are identified as important

either to interagency teams, in the case of the Johns Hopkins study, or CMT, in the case of the present research. Notably, however, the two research projects have divergent goals; this may explain the divergence in the types of final items found to be important. In this project we developed a model of competencies that define the key requirements for successful individual performance, whereas the Johns Hopkins study was striving to identify a series of "best practices." To illustrate the difference, two of our competencies are *Understands capabilities of partners and systems* and *Applies available resources and expertise*. Accomplishing these would likely be facilitated by *Keeping good records (*one of JHU's best practices). As a result, the two efforts provide complimentary information to define success in this domain.

CRC Functional Essential Task List Comparison. The third document for comparison was the Civilian Response Corps (CRC) Functional Essential Task List. The Civilian Response Corps is a program of the United States Department of State, Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS). Interagency discussions were held from April to October 2010 with the purpose of cataloguing current CRC efforts in support of U.S. government foreign policy. They identified essential tasks that were organized into seven different functional areas, according to priority (i.e., criticality, frequency, and complexity). A common set of competencies underlying these tasks was found. These competencies are based upon what CRC members need to *do* to perform the mission, what they need to *know*, and the *attitudes* that help them to succeed.

In our comparison we were able to link our competencies to the seven primary task areas (i.e., advises, assesses, coordinates, evaluates implements, manages, and plans) based on the descriptions provided for those areas. A comparison of the task descriptions with the CMT competency dimensions is shown at Appendix G. There were three CMT competencies that were not clearly reflected in the functional tasks: *C2 Cultural agility, C3 Understands multiple perspectives,* and *C6 Develops positive relationships,* although these may well be required for the *Advises* and *Coordinates* tasks.

While the two lists are convergent and complementary in nature, given their differing goals they would not be expected to "match." The CRC list is focused on the tasks CRC personnel need to do to perform their mission. These tasks include areas such as "Evaluates," which entails monitoring processes and activities, and "Implements," which entails designing, conducting, and managing activities. The CMT competencies, on the other hand, are focused on KSAOs and behaviors as opposed to tasks. Moreover, the CMT competencies are focused specifically on the teaming aspect of the job, to the exclusion of other tasks and competencies that may be required when providing support to the U.S. Government in countries affected by conflict (e.g., combat lifesaving).

Building Partner Capacity (BPC) Comparison. The U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command's draft study "Building Partner Capacity (BPC): Individual Training Line of Effort Action Plan" resulted in 21 "foundational skills" required by Soldiers at varying times in their careers. These foundational skills enable the General Purpose Forces to collectively train and execute missions that support BPC (Department of the Army, 2011, April). While the BPC model has elements that overlap with the CMT competencies, such as *U.S. Interagency Capabilities,* and *Negotiations,* there are a number of declarative knowledge categories that are

not directly relevant to CMT competencies (e.g., Information Operations, Understanding Media, or Threat Vulnerability Assessment). That is not to say that these elements are not important during CMT, it is only to say that those knowledge areas do not represent the key competencies required for successful *teaming*.

Appendix G shows CMT competencies that have a relationship with the foundational BPC skills. In the present project, linking BPC skills to CMT competencies was approached in a broadly inclusive manner such that even if the BPC skill and CMT competency had only a small amount of overlap (i.e., only some of the knowledge, skills, and abilities within the BPC categories overlapped with the knowledge, skills, and abilities in the CMT categories), the CMT competency was listed as related. For four of the BPC categories (*Language diversity, Information operations, Understanding media, and Transferring knowledge)* and one of the CMT categories (*Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving*) there is essentially no overlap, and for a number of other categories, the overlap is very small. These areas with no overlap or low levels of overlap will be identified in further detail in the following section that addresses existing training and training gaps. In the training section, CMT competencies that have only a low level of overlap with the BPC categories will be identified as areas for which it would be useful to add instruction or at least review the current instruction in further detail.

Army Leadership (Field Manual 6-22). Finally, we have examined the link between the CMT competencies and current Army Leadership doctrine. This comparison suggests that the CMT competencies are highly complementary with the Army Leadership competencies, as opposed to being overlapping (see Appendix G). Army Leadership doctrine highlights three key competency areas – Leads, Develops, and Achieves, with multiple components in each of the three areas: *Leads others, Extends influence beyond the chain of command, Leads by example, Communicates, Creates a positive environment, Prepares self, Develops leaders, and Gets results.* Our comparison to the CMT competencies suggest that a fourth key competency area, Collaborates, could be added. Within this competency area there would be three components – *Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures*, *Builds Partnering Relationships*, and *Collaborates to Solve Problems.* The result would be a complete integration of the competencies included in this report with the leadership competencies currently described in Field Manual 6-22 (Headquarters Department of the Army, October, 2006).

Summary. Comparison of the identified research projects was hindered to some degree by the various approaches used to identify relevant CMT competencies. Overall, however, the results of the various investigations are highly complementary. For example, skills identified in the BPC effort and competencies identified in the CMT effort are related (i.e., KSAs within the BPC categories overlap with KSAs in the CMT categories). As another example, key KSAs identified in the Markel et al. (2011) study generally fit within the CMT framework. Given that other studies included in the review include tasks and competencies which are outside the scope of civil-military teaming, it was not expected that the various models would match. Nevertheless, the results can be used to identify competencies and KSAOs needed for success in this domain.

Phase III: Review of Training and Education

Method

The objective of the third phase of the project was to understand the extent to which current training and education in CMT includes the competencies identified in the model. Three key documents with training and education information relevant to CMT were identified and selected for review vis-à-vis the CMT competency model:

- *Sharing the Space: A Study on Education and Training for Complex Operations* (Gunderson, U.S. Institute of Peace, & Consortium for Complex Operations, 2008)
- *Interagency Teaming to Counter Irregular Threats Handbook* (JHU/APL, 2009)
- *Building partner capacity: Individual training line of effort action plan* (Department of the Army, April, 2011)

Each of these reports was examined to determine if the courses they reviewed provided training relevant to one or more of the competencies in the CMT model.

Findings

Sharing the Space. This review was conducted by the USIP and the Consortium for Complex Operations (CCO). The study examined training and education for complex operations across 200 institutions, including civilian organizations such as U.S. government civilian agencies, academic institutions, NGOs, police, contractors, as well as U.S. military organizations. They used multiple methods that included three workshops with 100 participants, a survey of 200 training and education institutions, attendance at over 20 conferences, 10 site visits, and almost 500 phone interviews (Gunderson et al., 2008). Despite the extensive nature of the review, the authors indicate the review is not a definitive compilation of all courses, but rather is intended to provide a snapshot of relevant courses.

The review identified 44 courses labeled as *Civil-Military* courses, and other courses containing topics relevant to the CMT competencies, such as *Conflict resolution/mediation/negotiation, International/multilateral organizations, courses on working with other agencies, Cultural/Intercultural awareness, and Communication and public diplomacy.* Other course categories focused on additional aspects of complex operations such as *Stability operations/peace operations, Reconstruction and Stabilization*, and *Regional courses*. The report described the general availability of courses, the types of institutions offering the courses, the format of the courses (e.g. classroom vice web), and a summary of key issues in the domain. One drawback of the information contained in the report was that it did not indicate the exact nature of the content of the courses reviewed, so it was not possible to determine with certainty the extent to which the CMT competencies from the model were covered in the courses.

Based on the issues discussed in the report, however, it appears that the reviewed courses cover 7 of the 12 CMT competencies. Competencies that were not addressed were: *Assessing*

new cultural environments, Understanding multiple perspectives, Developing positive relationships, and two of the problem-solving competencies - *Uses integrative methods for planning and problem solving,* and *Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals*. A summary of the coverage can be found in Table 2. It is important to keep in mind that the five competencies not covered in the report may exist in a course; however, because it was not evident that these competencies were captured in the review they were not considered to be addressed in training.

Finally, while seven of the CMT competencies were identified as covered in existing courses, in all of the cases the report recommended improvements be made to the existing course content or structure. For that reason, the competency is described as "NI" (Needs Improvement) in Table 2, indicating that it was identified as covered in one or more courses but there could be improvements to its content. One example is *Understands the cultural context of situations*. Whereas the report pointed out that there are many courses available on this topic, the authors recommended developing more interactive courses that facilitate practice and application.

Interagency Teaming Handbook. The JHU/APL handbook on Interagency Teaming to Counter Irregular Threats was developed in 2009 to provide interagency team leaders and members with a basic understanding of the interagency environment, current challenges, and best practices for their interagency team while in the field. Thus, the handbook does not attempt to provide comprehensive information regarding training for CMT, but it was nevertheless identified as a project that contains information relevant to training. The JHU/APL data was collected through an online survey, interviews, site visits, and a literature review; specifics regarding participants and processes were not provided in the handbook.

A comparison of the JHU/APL training chapter with the CMT competency model revealed that only two of the competencies in the model were specifically mentioned in the chapter. This is most likely due to the fact that the predominance of courses listed in the review appear to provide knowledge training regarding different agencies and the interagency process. This is in contrast to the CMT competency model which includes knowledge and skills related to interpersonal and problem solving areas. Results of the comparison are presented in Table 2. It is important to note that while the CCO report evaluated the adequacy of the existing training for complex operations, the JHU/APL study identified the training, but did not provide an evaluation of adequacy – hence there are no "NI" ratings in Table 2 for JHU.

Building Partner Capacity. The goal of the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) study was to identify the current state of training for BPC and to determine a baseline of training and education for BPC efforts for the General Purpose Forces (GPF). As such, this goal diverges somewhat from our objective to identify training related specifically to civil-military teaming; nevertheless, because CMT can be considered a subset of the activities that occur during BPC, it is useful to review the findings. Researchers collected information through a two-day workshop at Ft. Monroe with 23 participants from the Army, civilian government, NGOs and other national and international groups. The authors identified the skills and competencies desired for BPC then used surveys to identify training gaps. In particular, they distinguished skills that are already captured under the Professional Military Education (PME) system (e.g., Intermediate Level Education, Army War College) or the Army

Culture and Foreign Language Strategy, from those that are not. The authors found that some of the 21 foundational skills for BPC were already adequately addressed in the PME system, while others were not.

The results were as follows:

1. Skills adequately addressed:
    - Culture awareness, using interpreters, and language diversity
    - Stability operations, organizational development, and information operations
    - Understanding reform, spoilers and drivers of conflict, and history and trends of conflict
2. Skills partially addressed:
    - Operational environment
    - Negotiations
    - U.S. Interagency capabilities
    - Communications and rapport
    - Understanding media Assessment
    - Mediation
    - Transferring knowledge
    - Information disclosure to non-U.S. forces
3. Training gaps for BPC:
    - Actors, dynamics, issues
    - Threat vulnerability assessment
    - Special case – Fundamentals of BPC

As shown in Table 2, the link between the BPC report and the CMT competency model suggests that two of the competencies, *Understands the cultural context* and *Establishes effective partnerships and teams* are captured in existing training. The latter competency, however, is divided between two BPC skills; the BPC skill *Stability operations* captures the concept of building partnerships, whereas *Organizational development* captures the concept of developing teams. *Organizational development* however, appears to focus on standard team development, as opposed to the development of teams comprised of leaders. It is important that the courses being taught cover aspects of partnerships and teaming specifically relevant to CMT; for example, developing teams of leaders as opposed to developing a team in which there is a single recognized leader and a group of followers (e.g., see Prevou, Veitch, & Sullivan, 2009). For that reason, the competency *Establishes effective partnerships and teams* is recommended for review rather than stating that it is sufficient as is (see Table 3).

Table 2

Coverage of CMT Competencies in Training and Education Reviews

Meta-Competency		Competency	Did the Report Identify the Competency as Covered in Training/Education?[1]		
			CCO[2]	JHU[3]	BPC[4]
Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures	1	Understands the cultural context of situations	NI	No	Yes
	2	Assesses new cultural environments and adjusts appropriately (cultural agility)	No	No	No
Builds Partnering Relationships	3	Understands multiple perspectives	No	No	No
	4	Understands capabilities of partners and systems	NI	Yes	NI
	5	Establishes effective partnerships and teams	NI	No	Yes
Collaborates to Solve Problems	6	Develops positive relationships	No	No	NI
	7	Builds common ground and shared purpose	NI	No	No
	8	Manages conflict	NI	Yes	NI
	9	Manages the flow of communication	NI	No	NI
	10	Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving	No	No	No
	11	Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals	No	No	No
	12	Applies available resources and expertise	NI	No	NI

Note:[1]Key: NI = Competency identified in a course(s) but described as needing improvement, No = Not specifically identified in a course, Yes = Competency was identified as covered; [2]CCO = *Sharing the Space: A Study on Education and Training for Complex Operations* (Gunderson et al., 2008); [3]JHU = *Interagency Teaming to Counter Irregular Threats* (JHU/APL, 2009); [4] BPC =Building Partner Capacity (Department of the Army, April, 2011)

Regarding the other CMT competencies, five competencies are described by the BPC report as not adequately covered. These are listed as "NI" for Needs Improvement in Tables 2 and 3. For the most part, the review indicated that these competencies were taught to Soldiers but were not adequate because they needed to be taught earlier in the Soldier's career. This is a point that the CMT project cannot address yet because basic, full, and expert proficiency levels must still be defined for each CMT competency. For these five competencies we therefore recommended reviewing the BPC recommendations once proficiency levels are developed (see Table 3).

Five CMT competencies are not specifically mentioned in the BPC report – these include *Assessing new cultural environments*, *Understanding multiple perspectives*, *Builds common ground and shared purpose*, *Uses integrative methods for planning and problem solving,* and *Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals*. Two of these fall within the meta-competency, Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures: *Assesses new cultural environments and adjusts appropriately* (*cultural agility)* and *Understands multiple perspectives*. Because of the relationship between these competencies and cultural competencies, we would recommend that training recommendations under the Army Culture and Foreign Language Strategy (ACFLS) be modified to include knowledge and skills related to these two competencies.

Another of the competencies not included in the BPC report, *Builds common ground and shared purpose,* falls under the meta-competency Builds Partnering Relationships. Based on the description provided for the BPC skill Organizational Development, we would recommend reviewing the courses in which organizational development is taught and adding a learning objective related to building common ground and shared purpose. In addition, there are a number of other competencies included in this meta-competency that appear to be addressed in a brief manner in current courses but may need to be more overtly addressed. As an example, *Establishes effective partnerships and teams* could be addressed within courses identified under the Organizational Development skill and *Managing conflict* could be incorporated within Mediation courses. These CMT competencies are listed with the CMT recommendation "Review" in Table 3. Again, these details could be more effectively addressed following the development of the proficiency levels for the CMT competencies.

Finally, in the meta-competency, Collaborates to Solve Problems, there are two competencies that are not currently included in the BPC skill list: *Uses integrative methods for planning and problem solving*, and *Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals*. We would recommend integrating a learning objective for the *Integrative planning and problem solving* competency within courses that teach U.S. Interagency capabilities. Similarly, *Synchronizing tactical actions* could be incorporated in courses associated with Operational Environment.

Summary

This review of the CMT competencies and existing training suggests that a number of these competencies are not currently covered in the PME. While we made recommendations regarding integrating development modules for these competencies into existing courses, it is

important to first define proficiency levels for each CMT competency. Because the reviews were reliant on projects that had differing objectives, and because the descriptions we had of the courses and the competencies were limited, the comparison should be viewed as preliminary.

Table 3

Link between CMT competencies and BPC skills

Meta-Competency		CMT Competency	Primary BPC Skill that Overlaps CMT Competency	Recommendation	
				BPC	CMT
Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures	1	Understands the cultural context of situations	Cultural Awareness	OK	OK
	2	Assesses new cultural environments and adjusts appropriately (cultural agility)	None	None	Add
	3	Understands multiple perspectives	None	None	Add
	4	Understands capabilities of partners and systems	U.S. Interagency Capabilities	NI	Review
Builds Partnering Relationships	5	Establishes effective partnerships and teams	Partnerships - Stability Operations; Teams - Organizational Development	OK	Review
	6	Develops positive relationships	Communications/ Rapport	NI	Review
	7	Builds common ground and shared purpose	None	None	Add
	8	Manages conflict	Mediation	NI	Review
	9	Manages the flow of communication	Communication/ Rapport	NI	Review
Collaborates to Solve Problems	10	Uses integrative methods for planning and problem solving	None	None	Add
	11	Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals	None	None	Add
	12	Applies available resources and expertise	U.S. Interagency Capabilities	NI	Review

*Note:[1]Key: NI = Competency identified in a course(s) but described as needing improvement, None = Not identified, no recommendation given, OK = Competency was identified as covered sufficiently; Add = add educational material related to this competency; Review = review for educational gaps again once the proficiency levels are developed

Discussion

Through a deliberate process based in both theory and qualitative empirical results, a draft model of civil military teaming (CMT) competencies was developed. The model emphasizes three meta-competencies: Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures, Builds Partnering Relationships, and Collaborates to Solve Problems. Within these three meta-competencies reside 12 competencies that provide further definition to each of these areas. Each of these competencies represents a pattern of knowledge, skills, abilities and other characteristics (KSAOs) that is needed to successfully perform civil-military teaming. These findings provide a preliminary answer to the key skills required for successful teaming in civil-military collaboration. In our accompanying decision analysis we derived a number of tasks supporting teaming and the critical decisions that must be practiced to achieve proficiency in field performance. The decision analysis provides rich descriptions of the challenges to CMT performance, the problem-solving strategies used by experienced practitioners, and factors that must be considered in decision-making. Understanding and managing these decisions is the hallmark of proficient performance and can form the basis for the development of training. Each task and decision area was also cross-walked with the 12 competencies. Taken together, these findings provide the foundation for the formation of learning objectives that will ensure a focus on the most critical skills needed in the field.

Preliminary content validation of the competencies was provided through a series of cognitive task analysis interviews. The cognitive task analysis approach is especially appropriate when expertise is not concentrated in one community of practice and is still emerging. Our approach is similar to those in recent studies in this area by Markel et al. (2011) and DeChurch et al. (2011). However, our approach goes beyond these studies by recognizing that civil-military teaming (CMT) expertise is situated in an ill-structured domain of practice (i.e., one with complexity, time pressure, variation among cases, and high stakes, which requires judgment and decision-making in uncertain circumstance). In such areas of practice, subject matter experts (SMEs) cannot easily articulate their expertise. Our cognitive task analysis approach allowed the experts to "unpack" their experiences, yielding greater information regarding the decisions made and the range of KSAOs used in performance. In addition, our interviews concentrated not only on incidents to understand KSAOs and behaviors, but also on identifying critical decisions that are part of proficient CMT.

The KSAOs and behaviors identified for each of the 12 competencies are consistent with previous research in the area. Our conclusions are, however, specifically targeted to support analysis of training and education objectives and to support training and education development. To continue this focus, we suggest several avenues of research and development that can follow and build on the findings from this effort. First, however, we address some of the limitations of the current approach.

Limitations and Further Validation and Expansion of the Competency Model

The scope of the current project did not allow for extensive validation of the proposed model and additional data is needed to corroborate the findings from this research. Specifically, further work is needed to identify the KSAOs associated with each competency. In the present

research, the sample size was not large enough to ensure that all KSAOs associated with civil-military teaming activities were identified. Although our overlap with the KSAOs identified in other recent investigations suggest we can be confident in our findings, further work is needed to expand and validate the competency model.

A second limitation is the need for more information regarding competencies required by the civilians who take part in civil-military teaming. Civilians with little-to-no military experience may require a different set of knowledge, skills, and abilities than those needed by military (or former military) team members. In the present project, some participants identified as 'civilians' had significant prior military experience. In order to assess the comprehensiveness of the current model, additional interviews should be conducted with civilian counterparts without prior military experience.

Finally, more information regarding the individuals surveyed (i.e., years deployed, rank, key experiences which shaped their perspective (military and civilian), types of teams served on, current position/duties, etc.) should have been collected. This information would have enabled better assessment of the qualifications of the interviewees as subject matter experts (SMEs) and would have ensured the generalizability of results to the broad range of individuals participating in civil-military operations. Although results of the current research appear to be on target, the final draft competency model should be considered preliminary and in need of further validation.

Future Research

Applied experiment to assess the impact of the competencies on performance. Validating the competencies can be achieved by understanding their impact on performance in an applied experiment. Such an experiment must address how well sovereign and diverse organizations with different operating procedures work together when the competencies and conditions vary across teams. We propose that the design of such an applied experiment mirror the structure applied by Prevou et al. (2009). Their research was designed to understand variations in performance across five distinct teams of leaders during an experiment carried out as part of an exercise conducted by the U.S. Army's European Command (EUCOM) Headquarters. Conducting a similar experiment targeted at teaching and coaching the CMT competencies could validate their effect in practice. The ability to identify a setting in which multiple organizations are represented and two or more teams can work toward the same mission goal is critical to the conduct of such an experiment.

Conducting a training and education analysis. A detailed gap analysis should be conducted following validation of all essential CMT competencies and their associated KSAOs. A gap analysis would identify which of the CMT competencies are already addressed in the training and education system, to what degree, and with what methods. In this effort, using the draft model, we attempted to determine the extent to which the identified competencies were reflected in recent reviews of existing training and education. Based on the Building Partner Capacity report we made a number of specific recommendations regarding integrating development modules for these competencies into existing courses (see Table 2). In order to conduct a more comprehensive analysis future research should first define proficiency levels for each CMT competency. Proficiency-levels define specific requirements for personnel operating

in basic awareness, fully proficient, or expert-level positions. Once proficiency levels have been established behavioral indicators for each competency can be tailored for different levels of expertise. This process sets a clear foundation to define learning objectives to train personnel at all skill levels. As stated previously, a detailed gap analysis would optimally be conducted using a final validated competency model. However, given the need to quickly refine training, Appendix H provides a toolkit that could be used to facilitate an independent internal gap analysis using the draft CMT competency model.

Applying the Competency Model and Decision Analysis to Training Development

In an attempt to understand how training to support teaming is typically carried out and what competencies are addressed, the data collection team observed training designed for the Civilian Expeditionary Workforce (CEW) by the Foreign Service Institute (FSI). Researchers observed participants in various vignettes designed to familiarize them with how to interact with Soldiers and with local national decision makers. Tasks included establishing relationships, negotiating, and utilizing persuasion tactics with role players. The CEW groups were also coached in ways to assess the local situation and then organize and present their findings to the local Commander in a battlefield update briefing.

While experienced Army and civilian representatives acted as coaches for the participants, little *deliberate* coaching was done regarding how to bring members of different organizations into a team. Teaming was principally witnessed within the CEW work groups as they tried to assess the situation and when they developed briefings to report findings to the Army officer in charge of the simulated operation. Because there were no deliberate exercises to jumpstart team cohesion built into the methodology, trust in the assigned teams had to develop over time. Additionally, the CEW work groups were not observed determining how they would work together, or establishing operating agreements, early in their lifecycle. This contributed to trial and error and retarded the speed at which the team built trust, confidence, and shared understanding. Therefore, exercises did not have as much impact as possible.

Because lack of teaming skills can diminish the effects of individual planning skills, adaptability, and technical expertise, all training and coursework of this nature should target teaming skills as part of the process. The addition of team process information and exercises would likely improve a wide range of training experiences and provide a foundation for field experiences. In order to establish context-based, collaborative, problem-centered instruction targeting competencies for which the Army is currently showing a strong demand, the Army must obtain information about field experiences - and this must be done in a manner that is useful for application.

Our approach in this project demonstrates one method for capturing experiences and framing them in a manner that can support not only the goal of CMT, but also the goals of the Army in general. The Decision Requirements analysis utilized in the present investigation provides rich material for developing or augmenting programs of instruction. The Decision Requirements Table (DRT), presented in Appendix F, captures key challenges faced by civilian and military personnel conducting civil-military operations. Included in the DRT are factors civilian and military personnel participating in the present project considered when problem-

solving, as well as strategies they used to make decisions and address common dilemmas. The data collected as part of this project can provide material for case studies, vignettes/practical exercise, and scenarios for simulation; in addition, data can be used to develop assessments for complex performance. Consistent with the approach advocated here, the U.S. Marine Corps is currently focused on improving small unit decision-making by directly targeting the development of instructors as facilitators and supporting the development of practical exercises and other methods to convert their current Squad Leader course to an experience-based course. These changes are directly based on the identification of underlying cognitive competencies and the use of field experiences to develop scenarios within a DRT-like framework.

Conclusion

The results of this research provide an initial model of competencies required for success in civil-military teaming. The suggested civil-military teaming (CMT) competency model has three higher-order meta-competencies, and 12 lower level competencies. Also outlined in the report are associated knowledge, skills, and abilities, along with critical decisions that are made when supporting effective CMT. The competency model and associated features that were identified for the present project provide a foundation for understanding performance requirements for CMT, a guideline for directing subsequent field research, and a basis for building recommendations regarding training and education.

In February 2012, the final draft CMT competency model was presented at the PKSOI Stability Operations Training and Education Conference. This presentation was in response to a challenge by the Director of Training Readiness and Strategy, Office of the Secretary of Defense and co-chair of the Interagency Policy Coordination Board on Training, Exercises, Experimentation, and Education (TE3), to identify a set of the 10 key skills needed for CMT, and a set of 10 key learning objectives on which the community should focus training. The results of this research offer an initial response to the first challenge, and a foundation to respond to the second. Future full validation of the model and the definition of proficiency levels will further support the development of targeted training. Building on the results of the present project, PKSOI and ARI are currently conducting research aimed at building interagency and inter-organizational partnerships. Greater understanding of civil-military/interagency teaming competencies will ultimately support collaboration among military, governmental, non-governmental, local national and civilian agencies - collaboration that is vital to success in today's military operations.

References

Baumann, A. B. (2008). Clash of organizational cultures? The challenge of integrating civilian and military efforts in stabilization operations. *Royal United Services Institute Journal*, *153,* 70-73.

Bogart, A. T. (2006). *Joint special operations university*: *One valley at a time* (JSOU Report 06-6)*.* Hurlburt Field, FL: Joint Special Operations University.

Celeski, J. D. (2005). *Joint special operations university: Operationalizing COIN* (JSOU Report 05-2). Hurlburt Field, FL: Joint Special Operations University.

Cerami, J. R. & Boggs, J. W. (Eds.). (2007). *The interagency and counterinsurgency warfare: stability, security transition, and reconstruction roles*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

Crandall, B., Klein, G., & Hoffman, R. (2006). *Working minds: A practitioner's guide to cognitive task analysis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

DeChurch, L. A., Burke, C. S., Shuffler, M., Lyons, R., Doty, D., & Salas, E. (2011). A historiometric analysis of leadership in mission critical multiteam environments. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*, 152-169. doi:10.1016/j.leadqua.2010.12.013.

Department of the Army. (1993). *Civil-military operations* (Field Manual 41-10). Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense.

Department of the Army. (2006). *Army leadership: Competent, confident, and agile* (Field Manual 6-22). Washington, DC: Author.

Department of the Army. (2008). *Stability operations* (Field Manual 3-07). Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combined Arms Doctrine Directorate, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center.

Department of the Army. (2011). *Building partner capacity: Individual training line of effort action plan* (Draft version 0.3).Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.

Gunderson, J., U.S. Institute of Peace, Consortium for Complex Operations. (2008). *Sharing the space: A study on education and training for complex operations.* Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace and Consortium for Complex Operations.

Hunt, J. P. (2010). The 800-pound gorilla and stability operations. *Small Wars Journal.* Retrieved from http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/journal/docs-temp/464-hunt.pdf.

Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory (JHU/APL). (2009). *Interagency teaming to counter irregular threats handbook.* Fort Meade, MD: U.S. Army Asymmetric Warfare Group.

Joint Chiefs of Staff. (2006). *Interagency, intergovernmental organization, and non-governmental organization coordination during joint operations: Volume I* (Joint Publication 3-08). Washington, DC: Department of Defense.

Joint Chiefs of Staff. (2008). *Civil-military operations* (Joint Publication 3-57). Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense.

Markel, M. W., Leonard, H. A., Lynch, C., Panis, C., Schirmer, P., & Sims, C. S. (2011). *Developing U.S. Army officers' capabilities for joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational environments* (RAND Arroyo Research Report prepared for the U.S. Army under Contract No. W74V8H-06-C-0001). Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Militello, L. G., & Hutton, R. J. B. (1998). Applied cognitive task analysis (ACTA): A practitioner's toolkit for understanding cognitive task demands. *Ergonomics, 41*(11), 1618-1641.

Mirabile, R. J. (1997). Everything you wanted to know about competency modeling. *Training and Development, 51,* 73-77.

Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS). (2011, February). *Civilian response corps functional essential task list*. Washington, D.C.: Author

Phillips, J. K., Shafer, J., Ross, K. G., & Cox, D. A. (2006). *Behaviorally anchored rating scales for the assessment of tactical thinking mental models*. (Research Report 1854). Arlington, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Polley, B. (2007). Leadership education and training for the interagency. In J. R. Cerami & J. R. Boggs (Eds.), *The interagency and counterinsurgency warfare: stability, security, transition, and reconstruction roles* (pp. 423-464). Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute.

Prevou, M., Veitch, R., & Sullivan, R. (2009). Teams of leaders: Raising the level of collaborative leader-team performance. *Proceedings of the Interservice/Industry Training, Simulation, and Education Conference*, Orlando, FL.

Rodriguez, D., Patel, R., Bright, A., Gregory, D., & Gowing, M. K. (2002). Developing competency models to promote integrated human resource practices. *Human Resource Management, 41*, 309-324.

Ross, K.G., Grome, A., Ong, J., Arrastia, M., Schaab, B. B. & Spangler, D. (2009). Development and validation of training themes for joint, interagency, intergovernmental and multinational (JIIM) operations. *Proceedings of the Interservice/Industry Training, Simulation, and Education Conference,* Orlando, FL.

Ross, K. G., Thornson, C. A., McDonald, D. P., Fritzsche, B. A., & Le, H. (2010). Development of the Cross-Cultural Competence Inventory (3CI). In D. Schmorrow & D. Nicholson (Eds.), *Advances in cross-cultural decision-making* (pp. 87-96). Boca Raton, FL: Taylor & Francis Group.

Salmoni, B. A., Hart, J., McPherson, R., & Winn, A. K. (2010). Growing strategic leaders for future conflict. *Parameters, 40*(1), 72-88.

Schmitt, L., (2008a, March). *International space station human behavior & performance competency model volume I* (Technical Memorandum 21477). Washington, D.C.: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Schmitt, L., (2008b, April). *International space station human behavior & performance competency model volume II* (NASA Technical Memorandum 214775). Washington, D.C.: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Shippman, J. S., Ash, R. A., Battista, M., Carr, L., Eyde, L. D., Hesketh, B., Sanchez, J. I. (2000). The practice of competency modeling. *Personnel Psychology, 53,* 703-740. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2000.tb00220.

United States Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). (2011). *The U.S. Army learning concept* (Pamphlet 525-8-2). Washington, DC: United States Department of the Army.

United States Institute of Peace (USIP) and the United States Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI). (2009). *Guiding principles for stabilization and reconstruction.* Washington, DC: Endowment of the United States Institute of Peace.

United States Joint Forces Command. (2007, March) *Commander's handbook for the joint interagency coordination group.* Suffolk, VA: Joint Warfighting Center.

Appendix A

Initial Civil-Military Competency Model with Definitions

Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures	
Understands the cultural context of situations	Understands the situation within its historical, regional, and cultural (national or organizational) context.
	Keeps up-to-date on local, national, and international policies and trends that affect own organization and shape stakeholders' views.
Assesses new cultural environments and adjusts appropriately (cultural agility)	Displays insight into cultural impacts and perceptions when pursuing operational objectives.
	Rapidly adapts to ambiguous or emerging conditions, opportunities, risks, new information, or unexpected obstacles; demonstrates a willingness to adapt as the situation dictates.
	Is able to assess the environment and acquire new or more effective behaviors as context and roles change.
	Is reflective and demonstrates awareness of biases (both personal and belonging to own organization).
	Can turn observations and insights into course corrections dynamically.
Understands multiple perspectives	Is able to shift own perspective to see situations from other people's points of view.
	Recognizes which aspects of different issues or situations are relevant to each party in order to understand, predict, and influence behavior.
	Is aware of how one's own organization is perceived by other organizations/entities, and anticipates how various actions and decisions will be interpreted by others.
	Keeps in check one's own tendency to interpret others' decisions and actions based on one's own experiences, beliefs, assumptions, and value system.
Builds Partnering Relationships	

Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures

Understands capabilities of partners and systems	Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the actors within the operation and key partnerships. Is familiar with different organizational power structures, communication styles, technologies, and metrics, and understands their potential impact on goal focus, information sharing, planning, and decision-making. Understands organizational dynamics at the conceptual and applied levels. Comprehends the interdependencies between systems, decisions, organizations, etc., and the tools that support their management.
Establishes effective partnerships and teams	Facilitates cohesion and cooperation, and motivates partners/team members to accomplish joint goals. Facilitates teamwork across organizational boundaries by fostering team commitment, spirit, pride, trust, and a climate of openness. Accommodates a variety of interpersonal styles and perspectives in order to partner effectively, achieve objectives, and remove barriers. Understands team capabilities and dynamics in order to identify and leverage expertise. Breaks down polarizing or stove-piped perspectives within and across organizational boundaries. Develops networks, establishes alliances, and collaborates effectively across boundaries to build strategic relationships and achieve common goals.
Develops positive relationships	Is willing to engage and cultivate relationships with people who may be very different from self. Develops and leverages a diverse range of key relationships to build bridges across institutional divides and improve access to resources and expertise. Considers and responds appropriately to the needs and feelings of different people in different situations. Actively listens and responds to others while demonstrating an understanding of their comments and questions.

Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures

Builds common ground and shared purpose	Establishes and maintains common ground as a basis for creating shared purpose, and achieving mutually sought goals and unity of effort. Explores and articulates alternatives to develop the best ideas, obtain resources, elicit commitment and/or agreement, and accomplish mutually important goals. Facilitates processes and outcomes that are mutually acceptable to all involved parties. Considers underlying consequences for key stakeholders while seeking and negotiating win/win solutions.
Manages conflict	Manages and resolves individual and organizational conflicts and disagreements in a constructive manner to achieve a unified effort both internal and external to the team. Anticipates and takes steps to prevent counterproductive confrontations. Defines barriers and mediates differences to reach acceptable and viable solutions.
Manages the flow of communication	Recognizes that organizations differ in their information needs, priorities, and sense of willingness and/or urgency for information sharing. Understands and respects that methods, technologies, and channels of communication differ across organizations and situations (e.g., method of presentation, who shares information, how authority for information sharing is managed, how complete information must be to support decisions). Communicates effectively with broad audiences and external organizations, tailoring communication to a level appropriate for the intended audience and inspiring the acceptance of ideas requiring collaboration among diverse partners. Conveys and describes facts or ideas in a clear, logical, and comprehensive manner both orally and in writing. Fosters an atmosphere of open communication by encouraging others to share differing perspectives.

Collaborates to Solve Problems

Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures

Uses integrative methods for planning and solving problems

Recognizes that problems are multifaceted and understands how different parts of a problem relate to each other, as well as the different perspectives and needs that problem-solving partners contribute.

Develops and shares problem-solving methodologies that serve to reconcile competing viewpoints while remaining focused on the goals at hand.

Supports iterative problem-solving in the absence of perfect solutions.

Collaborates effectively in 'virtual' as well as face to face environments Demonstrates the capacity to lead, plan, manage, or participate in a supporting role with individuals from foreign nations as well as with interagency counterparts, members of other services, and NGOs, in spite of differences in national/institutional cultures and processes.

Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals

Demonstrates the ability to harmonize tactical planning with operational objectives and strategic goals, accounting for the consequences of decisions and/or actions over time and across multiple levels and lines of operations.

Sees the big picture and understands implications of 2nd and 3rd order effects of plans and actions for own as well as partner organizations.

Formulates objectives and priorities, and implements plans in conjunction with the efforts of many people, organizations, and communities.

Capitalizes on opportunities and manages risks.

Applies available resources and expertise

Identifies the resources and expertise in own and other organizations/entities needed to address common goals.

Demonstrates the ability to cooperatively acquire and administer human, financial, material, and information resources to accomplish the mission.

Matches assets to the appropriate problems, not just those that are most salient to own organization.

Develops workarounds where resources are constrained or barriers to access exist.

Understands own boundaries for action and manages expectations accordingly.

Appendix B

Phase II Interview Participants

Type of Personnel	Years in Service	Area of Specialty	Organization
Civilian	10 - Civilian 24 - Military	Professional Military Education	Command and General Staff College (CGSC)
Civilian	2 – Civilian 11- Military	Stabilization	Private Company
Civilian	22 - Civilian	Law Enforcement	Private Company
Civilian	9 – Civilian	Agriculture	USDA
Civilian	40 – Civilian 3 – Military	Agriculture	NGO
Civilian	1 - Civilian 11 - Military	Stabilization	Department of State
Civilian	1 - Civilian 22 - Active Duty	Mechanic	Department of Defense
Civilian	36 - Civilian 4 - Military	Development	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Civilian	3 - Civilian 10 - Military	City Planning	Department of Defense
Civilian	1 - Civilian 30 - Military	Stabilization	S/CRS
Civilian	11 - Civilian 10 - Military	Development	USAID
Civilian	15 - Civilian	Development	USAID
Military	32 - Military	Civil-Military OPS	U.S. Army
Military	29 - Military	Aviation	U.S. Army National Guard
Military	18 - Military	Civil-Military OPS	U.S. Army

Type of Personnel	Years in Service	Area of Specialty	Organization
Military	27 - Military	Intelligence	USMC Reserves
Military	25 - Military	Chemical Corps	U.S. Army National Guard
Military	25 - Military	Intelligence	U.S. Army National Guard
Military	29 - Military	Armor	U.S. Army

Appendix C

Protocol for Phase II Individual Semi-Structured Interviews

Civil-Military Teaming – Subject Matter Expert Interview Guide

Time Allotted: 1.5 to 2 Hours

Goals for the Interviews:

1. Collect first hand narratives of incidents that represent the following types of civil-military interactions:
   a. Creating a civil-military unified strategy
   b. Planning civil-military operations
   c. Executing civil-military operations
   d. Determining the impact/success of civil-military operations
   e. Transition of authority to newly deployed personnel
   f. Overcoming agency and cultural barriers to represent a unified USG team

2. Identify the decisions and judgments related to successful civil-military operations

3. Identify the core knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors that are required for successful civil-military collaboration

Background (10 minutes)

Project Description and Flow of Interview

SAY: The purpose of our project is to explore how civilians and military personnel work together effectively to plan and execute joint operations. We are interested in the nature of how different professionals, from different institutions with different working cultures, come together to form ad hoc teams and represent a unified effort operating on behalf of the United States Government.

We'll begin by asking you to tell us about your job working within the civil-military operational environment. Then, we'll ask you to provide specific stories and examples from your deployment that showcase the important facets of civil-military collaboration.

Informed Consent

DO: Provide the Subject Matter Expert with two copies of the informed consent form, one to sign and return and one to keep.

ASK: We would like to audio record the interview just as a method for taking notes. We will not distribute the results outside the research team or maintain an audio file that identifies you by name. Would that be OK? Do you have any questions about the project or what we are here to do?

Demographics

DO: Using the demographics form, ask the SME the questions and record them yourself to ensure you have a complete understanding.

Task Diagram (15 minutes)

SAY: We're interested in understanding what you personally did to work effectively in a civil-military operational environment. We want to know how you thought about your job and what you needed to do in order to be successful in planning and executing civil-military operations.

- If you could break down for us the major components of your daily job for working effectively in a civil-military environment, what would the 4-6 key tasks be? (Choose the job/deployment that is most interesting/relevant to the study if more than one was described on the demographics form.)
- Please describe each of these tasks briefly so that I can understand what they entail. We will go into greater detail in a little bit.
- Of these tasks, which ones require the most judgment and decision-making skill in order to be an effective collaborator in this environment?

DO: Select the task that seems the most promising as a means of identifying an incident for the CDM portion of the interview. Proceed to identify other incidents for CDM as time permits.

CDM – Incident Identification (10 minutes)

SAY: We're interested in hearing about some specific examples of situations where you, personally, had to *<conduct task from Task Diagram>*, and where your experience and skills really made the difference in handling the situation well, and where someone less experienced wouldn't have dealt with it as well or easily as you did, or where you yourself might have handled it less effectively when you were less experienced.

- Can you think of a time when you were *<insert task>* and the situation required you to make tough decisions or assessments about how to work effectively in a civil-military or interagency environment?
- Can you think of a time when you were personally involved in a civil-military operation *<or other task from Task Diagram>* that went extremely well?
- Can you think of a story that should be a model for others on how to work together effectively in civil-military environments?
- How about a time when you were really glad you were the one on the "hot seat" because you knew what to do and were confident about your ability to impact the situation?
- How about a time when you approached the situation differently than you might have earlier on in your deployment, because you got smart about how to operate in this AO?
- Can you think of a time when you were personally involved in a civil-military operation and it just totally fell apart and was not successful?

The kind of event we're looking for could have happened over a few minutes, a few hours, several days, or even weeks. I'd like to understand at a high level what happened. Can you give me a brief synopsis from beginning to end? *Ask the SME if they consider this event to be an example at the tactical, operational or strategic level.*

DO: Gather a few examples of stories before determining which one to focus on for the rest of the CDM interview.

CDM - Timeline (15 minutes)

DO: Explain that you would like to create a timeline of the key events of the incident. If there is a whiteboard available, draw out the event on a timeline so that it is visible to all. Start with the beginning and identify the first key point. Then identify the last key point/resolution/outcome on the timeline. Work with the SME to identify all the key points in between.

SAY: I want to understand all the key points in this story at a high level. A key point might be critical decisions you had to make, shifts in your understanding of the situation, key points of coordination that took place with others, or changes in your mission or strategy for this operation.
Once we have each of these key points mapped out on the timeline, we'll go back and spend time talking about each of them in greater detail.

DO: Paraphrase the incident back to the SME to ensure that you have all the relevant components of the situation. Add additional information to your timeline as he/she corrects your understanding of the events and expands upon the initial story.

For each key element, ask the SME what important decisions he/she was making, what his/her goal was for responding to the situation, and how his/her understanding of the situation was forming/shifting over time.

Additional Questions for mapping out the timeline:

- What was your mission?
- When did you first hear about the mission, and what were you told at that time?
- Who were the other key players involved in this situation?
- What information did you have about the situation going into it?
- What was the main problem you needed to address, in one or two sentences?
- Was this something you expected?
- Was this a novel or atypical mission? If so, how?
- When did this occur… day-night, summer, early in your deployment….?
- What was the setting in which this event took place?

DO: Deepen on each decision/critical point. Use the following questions as starting points for understanding what was happening in each phase of the incident:

Sizing up the Situation

- What was it about the situation that let you know what was happening?
- What was it about the situation that let you know what to do?
- What were you trying to accomplish at this point? What were your goals?
- What made this situation difficult or challenging?
- Did you have a sense what was going to happen or how events would unfold?
- What were you most worried about? Why?
- What were the concerns of others?

Information Management

- What information were you relying on to form your judgments and assessments? How did you get that information?
- To whom did you provide information?
- What did you NOT know that you really needed to know? Could you have gotten that information?

Strategies

- What strategies/ techniques did you employ to help achieve these goals?
- What training or preparation helped you know how to respond in this situation?
- Did you consider other alternatives in this situation? Why or why not?
- How did the culture of the host nation impact the strategies you employed in this situation?

Team Processes

- What was happening with regards to team coordination and collaboration?
- How was the team employing the skills of the various members?
- How was the team employing the resources of the various members?
- What were others on the team doing that you noticed were particularly effective?
- What aided/impeded your ability to work effectively with your civil-military partners?
- Can you describe the culture of the civil-military team at this time? (communication, coordination, planning, goal setting, etc.)
- How did the organizational cultures from the various agency partners shape how the civil-military team worked together?

CDM – Hypotheticals (20 minutes)

DO: Once you have deepened on every decision point, ask hypothetical questions about the incident as a whole.

SAY:
- If you could do this event over, what would you do differently?
- Might someone else have approached this situation differently than you did?
- Would you have handled this situation any differently earlier in your career or earlier in your deployment?
- What would've made this situation easier for you? More difficult?
- If we put a novice in this situation, what mistakes might they have made? Why would they have made those?
- How would you advise someone to prepare for this situation in a similar deployment?
- Have you been in similar situations since? What was different?

General Questions (10 minutes)

DO: Time permitting, ask the SME about the general KSAs that are important for operating effectively in civil-military environments:

- *How well did the training you have had prepare you for civil-military teaming?*
- What key abilities, skills, and attributes should Army officers assigned to civil-military teams possess?
- What educational and training objectives contribute to the success of civil-military teams?
- Do the KSAOs differ for Army personnel assigned to civil-military teams at the tactical, operational, and strategic levels of war? How so? How should Army education/training change based upon the findings?
- What are the cultural differences among inter-agency professionals and Army officers that hinder achieving unity of effort? How can those differences be overcome? Is the answer different for achieving unity of purpose?
- What do Army professionals understand about achieving whole of government approach? Comprehensive approach?
- What do Army professionals understand about achieving unity of purpose and unity of effort?
- Who are the different actors/groups operating within and/or influencing the Area of Operation (AOR) and what are the expected/optimum levels of interaction between them and the Army? Expectations from multiple viewpoints
- What are the cultural differences among the different actors/groups and Army officers that hinder achieving unity of purpose? How can those differences be overcome? Is the answer different for achieving unity of effort?

Appendix D

Frequency Counts of Competencies Identified During Phase II Data Analysis

Competency Analysis: Frequency Counts of Competencies Identified

As the table below demonstrates, the first competency, **Understands the cultural context of situations** (*maintains an accurate perception of the situation by keeping up-to-date on local, national, and international policies; aware of trends that influence his/her own organization and shape stakeholder views*) was the most-frequently uncovered competency. It was demonstrated 34 times across participants, with a frequency between zero and four times. This competency was not used by only two of the 19 interviewees.

Competency Analysis Results

Participant	1st Meta-Competency				2nd Meta-Competency							3rd Meta-Competency			Number of Competencies Identified by Participant
	C1	C2	C3		C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9		C10	C11	C12	
1		2						1		1					4
2	3	2	1			1	1	2		2		2	2	1	17
3	3	3	1		1	2	1	2	1	1		1	1	1	18
4	2	3	2		4	5	1	1	1	1		3	3	2	28
5	1	2	2		4	2		1	1	2		2	3	2	22
6	4		1		6	3	2			1		1		1	19
7	2	1	1		2	2	3		2	1					14
8	3							1	2	1		1	1		9
9	1	2	1		1	1	1	1					1		9
10	1	1			2	1				3				1	9
11	1	2	1			1	1			1		1	2	1	11
12	1	1	1		1	2	1		1	1				1	10
13	4				1	2	1		3	3		2			16
14	2	1			2		3		1	1		1		3	14
15	2				3	1							2		8
16	1		1			2	1	2	2			1	1	1	12
17	1	1	1			1	1			1		1	1	2	10
18	2	1	2		1	1	1	1		1		1	1		12
19						1	1	1	1	1			1		6
Frequency	34	20	15		28	28	19	12	16	20		17	19	16	

Competency 2, **Cultural agility** (*assesses new cultural environments and adjusts appropriately and acquires new or more effective behaviors as context and roles change*) was represented across interviewees a total of 20 times, with a range between zero and three times. This competency was not represented at all by six of the 19 interviewees.

Competency 3, **Understands multiple perspectives** (*shifts own perspective to see situations from other people's points of view in order to understand, predict, and coordinate*

behavior) was represented 15 times across participants, with a range between zero and two times. This competency was not represented at all by seven of the interviewees.

Therefore, the first *meta-competency*, **Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures**, made up of the first three competencies, was represented a total of 69 times, making this meta-competency the second most frequently cited of the three.

Competency 4, ***Understands capabilities of partners and systems*** (*demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the actors within the operation and key partnerships*), tied for the second most-represented competency, and was represented a total of 28 times across the interviews. This competency seemed to be the most variable, in that its frequency ranged from zero to six times, and it was not represented at all by seven different interviewees.

Competency 5, ***Establishes effective partnerships and teams*** (*develops networks, establishes alliances, and collaborates effectively across boundaries to build strategic relationships and achieve coordinated goals*), was also represented a total of 28 times across the 19 interviews. This competency was demonstrated between zero and five times by each interviewee, and was not represented at all by three of the 19 interviewees.

Competency 6, ***Develops positive relationships*** (*engages and cultivates relationships with people who may be very different from oneself; develops and leverages a diverse range of key relationships*), was demonstrated by interviewees a total of 19 times, with a range between zero and three times. This competency was not represented at all by five of the 19 interviewees.

Competency 7, ***Builds common ground and shared purpose*** (*establishes and maintains common ground as a basis for creating shared purpose, and achieving mutually sought goals and unity of effort*), was represented a total of 12 times across the 19 interviewees, making it the least frequently demonstrated of the 12 competencies. It ranged between zero and two times per interviewee and was not represented at all by nine of the 19 interviewees.

Competency 8, ***Manages conflict*** (*manages and resolves individual and organizational conflicts and disagreements in a constructive manner to achieve a consensual effort both internal and external to the team*), was represented a total of 16 times, with a range between zero and three times. This competency was not represented at all by eight of the 19 interviewees.

Competency 9, ***Manages the flow of communication*** (*recognizes that organizations differ in their information needs, priorities, and sense of willingness and/or urgency for information sharing*), was documented 20 times across interviews, with a range between zero and three times. It was not represented at all by four of the 19 interviewees.

The foregoing six competencies encompass the second meta-competency, **Builds Partnering Relationships.** This meta-competency was represented a total of 123 times across participants.

Competency 10, ***Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving*** (*demonstrates the capacity to lead, plan, manage, or participate in a supporting role with*

individuals from foreign nations as well as with interagency counterparts, members of other services, and NGOs, in spite of differences in national/institutional cultures and processes), was represented a total of 17 times. The frequency ranged between zero and three times and was not represented at all by seven of the interviewees.

Competency 11, ***Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals*** (*demonstrates the ability to harmonize tactical planning with operational objectives and strategic goals, accounting for the consequences of decisions and/or actions over time and across multiple levels and lines of operations*), was demonstrated 19 times by interviewees, with a range between zero and three times. This competency was also not demonstrated by seven of the 19 interviewees

Finally, Competency 12, ***Applies available resources and expertise*** (*demonstrates the ability to cooperatively acquire and administer human, financial, material, and information resources to accomplish the mission*), was represented a total of 16 times, with a range between zero and three times. This competency was not represented at all by eight of the 19 interviewees.

Therefore, the third and final meta-competency, **Collaborates to Solve Problems,** was demonstrated across Competencies 10 through 12, a total of 52 times, making it the least cited of the three meta-competencies.

Appendix E

Final Draft Civil-Military Teaming Competency Model

1St Meta-Competency: Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures

Competency 1: Understands the cultural context of situations

Maintains an accurate perception of the situation by keeping up-to-date on local, national, and international policies; aware of trends that influence his/her own organization and shape stakeholder views.

Knowledge

- Understands the situation within its historical, regional, and cultural context.
- Understands policies and processes of other cultures, agencies, services, and NGOs.
- Knows how and where to obtain relevant information.
- Knows how to assemble all relevant facts.
- Aware of trends that influence organizations and shape stakeholder views.

Skills

- Assesses impacts of actions, plans, and decisions on others.
- Uses understanding of cultural factors and circumstances to interpret team members' behaviors.
- Projects the current situation and analyzes "what if" scenarios.
- Engages in critical thinking.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Willing to persist in seeking relevant information.
- Committed to checking the accuracy and completeness of information.
- Committed to questioning own perceptions and experiences.
- Does not consider own culture superior.
- Believes that diversity within a multicultural team is a source of strength rather than a weakness.

Behavioral Indicators

- Keeps up-to-date on local, national, and international policies and trends that affect own organization and shape stakeholders' views.
- Takes steps to increase the situational awareness of self and team members.

Competency 2: Cultural agility

Assesses new cultural environments and acquires new or more effective behaviors as context and roles change.

Knowledge

- Understands social norms and styles of communication for other cultures.
- Understands one's own cultural stereotypes and biases.
- Understands the ways in which cultures are similar and different.
- Understands how cultural factors, values, and beliefs influence people's behaviors.
- Understands how cultural stereotypes and prejudices develop.
- Knows which behaviors members of other cultures may misinterpret as disrespectful.
- Aware of own personal biases.

Skills

- Articulates insight into cultural impacts and perceptions when pursuing operational objectives.
- Explains how one's own behavior may cause misunderstanding in multicultural settings and how to avoid misunderstandings.
- Describes insight into how s/he has changed, personally and/or professionally, as a result of working in a multicultural team.
- Establishes rapport and builds relationships with people from other cultural backgrounds.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Appreciates and respects representatives from multiple cultures.
- Open-minded to cultural differences.
- Willing to learn about team members' cultures.
- Persistent in trying to overcome cultural challenges.
- Appreciative of alternative solutions or approaches of other cultures.

Behavioral Indicators

- Rapidly adapts to ambiguous or emerging conditions, opportunities, risks, new information, or unexpected obstacles.
- Adapts one's own behavior as the situation dictates, turning observations and insights into course corrections in dynamic time.
- Adjusts one's own behavior to avoid or correct misunderstandings.
- Displays empathy in working with and leading others, despite differences.
- Mitigates the impact of stereotypes and prejudices on group interaction.
- Adjusts actions in relation to cultural cues.

Behavioral Indicators (continued)

- Communicates respectfully with individuals of different cultures.

Competency 3: Understands multiple perspectives

Is able to shift own perspective to see situations from other people's points of view in order to understand, predict, and coordinate behavior.

Knowledge

- Understands the principles of goal setting and motivation.
- Understands perceptions that can block perspective-taking.

Skills

- Recognizes which aspects of different issues or situations are relevant to each party.
- Aware of how one's own organization is perceived by other organizations/entities.
- Keeps in check the tendency to interpret others' decisions and actions based on one's own experiences, beliefs, assumptions, and value system.
- Recognizes others' needs and the motivations behind their behaviors.
- Recognizes the importance of empowering others.
- Anticipates how various actions and decisions will be interpreted.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Able to shift own perspective and perceive situations from another's point of view.
- Committed to building trust.
- Willing to listen to others.
- Committed to respecting team members' capabilities and preferences.
- Is able to admit own weaknesses, limitations, or errors.

Behavioral Indicators

- Understands, predicts, and coordinates others' behaviors.
- Uses empowerment techniques to influence and motivate others.
- Establishes and maintains open communications.
- Encourages the participation of all team members.

2nd Meta-Competency: Builds Partnering Relationships

Competency 4: Understands capabilities of partners and systems

Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the actors within the operation and key partnerships.

Knowledge

- Familiar with different organizational power structures, communication styles, technologies, and metrics.
- Understands the potential impacts of power structures, communication styles, and preferences on goal focus, information sharing, planning, and decision-making.
- Comprehends the interdependencies between systems, decisions, organizations, and the tools that support one's own organization.
- Understands organizational system components and functionality.
- Understands organizational dynamics at the conceptual and applied levels.

Skills

- Considers what contingencies or situations might evolve from the current situation.
- Considers the impact of one's own plans, actions, and decisions on others.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Willing to identify expertise and capabilities within one's own team and across partners.
- Respects role and history of other teams and organizations in the operational area.

Behavioral Indicators

- Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the actors and key partnerships within the operation (e.g., adjusts communication styles appropriately with different organizations and partners).

Competency 5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams

Develops networks, establishes alliances, and collaborates effectively across boundaries to build strategic relationships and achieve coordinated goals.

Knowledge

- Knows how to access resources and expertise.
- Aware of team roles in the operation.

Knowledge (continued)

- Understands pertinent sources of information to direct his/her team members to accomplish mission goals.
- Understands team capabilities and dynamics.
- Comprehends the consequences of acting competitively.
- Comprehends the benefits of acting cooperatively.

Skills

- Leverages individual strengths of team members within and across organizations.
- Accommodates a variety of interpersonal styles and perspectives.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Able to share practical experience and lessons learned.
- Appreciates the value of teamwork over individual effort.
- Appreciates the value of task distribution within a team.
- Willing to express appreciation to team members.
- Willing to share knowledge, skills, and learning opportunities.
- Willing to prioritize mission goals over personal credit or professional achievement.
- Willing to place common goals above individual needs.
- Willing to shift priorities and assignments to maintain team cohesion.
- Willing to listen.
- Committed to professional and personal development of team members.
- Committed to maintaining team cohesion.
- Tolerant of uncertainty.

Behavioral Indicators

- Facilitates cohesion and cooperation among team members and partners.
- Motivates partners/team members to accomplish coordinated goals.
- Facilitates teamwork across organizational boundaries.
- Fosters team commitment, spirit, pride, trust, and a climate of openness.
- Partners effectively to achieve objectives and remove barriers.
- Breaks down polarizing or stove-piped perspectives within and across organizational boundaries.
- Builds strategic relationships to achieve coordinated goals.
- Develops networks, establishes alliances, and collaborates effectively across boundaries.
- Acts cooperatively rather than competitively.
- Provides direction, information, feedback, encouragement, and coaching as needed.

Competency 6: Develops positive relationships

Is willing to engage and cultivate relationships with people who may be very different from self; develops and leverages a diverse range of key relationships.

Knowledge

- Knows how to ascertain team members' needs.
- Aware of strengths and weaknesses of self and others.
- Understands the consequences of not providing assistance to other team members when they need it.
- Understands the importance of team cohesion and mission needs over personal preferences.
- Understands how to build rapport and maintain relationships.

Skills

- Responds appropriately to the needs and feelings of different people in different situations.
- Actively listens and responds to others while demonstrating an understanding of their comments and questions.
- Offers assistance without embarrassing team member, showing disrespect or lack of confidence, or infringing on their role.
- Does not give the impression of feeling self important and superior.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Willing to engage with people who may be very different from self.
- Willing to provide assistance when needed.
- Considers the needs and feelings of different people in different situations.
- Able to express empathy and respect for team members.
- Respects and appreciates differences without trying to change others.
- Respects team members' roles and responsibilities.
- Committed to maintaining team cohesion.
- Values importance of team cohesion over personal preferences.
- Appreciates that there are different paths to success.
- Demonstrates personal humility by not always drawing all attention to self or taking all the credit for achievements.

Behavioral Indicators

- Develops and leverages a diverse range of key relationships.
- Builds bridges across institutional divides.

Behavioral Indicators (continued)

- Offers and provides assistance if accepted.
- Shares attention and credit for achievements with others.

Competency 7: Builds common ground and shared purpose

Works with others to develop the best ideas, obtain resources, elicit commitment and/or agreement, and accomplish mutually important goals.

Knowledge

- Knows techniques for successful negotiations.

Skills

- Facilitates mutually beneficial processes and outcomes.
- Negotiates win-win solutions by considering the underlying consequences for stakeholders during negotiations.
- Understands how, when, and what information to share.
- Provides and receives constructive feedback.
- Engages in active listening (e.g., summarizing, questioning).
- Removes or works around communication barriers.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Committed to providing constructive feedback.
- Willing to exchange feedback.
- Willing to compromise.
- Willing to listen.
- Able to maintain composure in adverse and uncertain circumstances.
- Tolerant of uncertainty.

Behavioral Indicators

- Establishes and maintains common ground as a basis for creating shared purpose, unity of effort, and achieving mutually sought goals.
- Explores alternatives as needed to reach consensus or reach a goal.
- Encourages the participation of team members.
- Encourages frank communication, friendly debate, and discussion.
- Encourages inputs, and questions from others.
- Asks others' opinion, feedback, suggestions, and points of view.

Competency 8: Manages conflict

Manages and resolves individual and organizational conflicts and disagreements in a constructive manner to achieve a consensual effort, both internal and external to the team.

Knowledge

- Understands barriers that prevent acceptable and viable solutions.
- Understands the potential for conflicts among people with different cultural backgrounds.
- Understands how certain behaviors can damage relationships during an argument.
- Understands compromise and mediation techniques for resolving conflict.
- Knows there is a difference between professional disagreement and personal conflict.
- Recognizes the potential for conflict among organizational and individual goals.

Skills

- Anticipates counterproductive confrontations.
- Cued into potential sources and signs of conflict.
- Readily perceives the situations in which conflicts are more likely to occur.
- Applies compromise and mediation tactics for averting conflict.
- Applies conflict management strategies.
- Adapts the right conflict management strategy to the situation.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Able to maintain objectivity during a disagreement.
- Able to place cohesion and mission needs over individual preferences.
- Able to give and take to build consensus.
- Has concern for team members' needs, preferences, and emotional states.
- Willing to accept the consequences of being the first to acknowledge or discuss a conflict.
- Willing to address potential conflicts early on.
- Committed to preserving relationships within the team.
- Committed to maintaining an atmosphere of open communication.
- Able to maintain composure in interpersonal conflicts.
- Maintains objectivity by not allowing disagreements to impact joint professional activities or team relationships.
- Able to focus on what is wrong rather than who is wrong.
- Willing to compromise.

Behavioral Indicators

- Achieves a consensual effort both internal and external to the team.

Behavioral Indicators (continued)

- Takes steps to prevent counterproductive confrontations.
- Manages and resolves individual and organizational conflicts and disagreements in a constructive manner.
- Mediates differences to reach acceptable and viable solutions.
- Addresses potential sources of conflict.
- Participates in the discussion of a problem without expressing blame, anger, or hostility.
- Establishes and maintains a rational and mutually respectful atmosphere.
- Applies non-confrontational methods for exchanging perspectives.

Competency 9: Manages the flow of communication

Recognizes that organizations differ in their information needs, priorities, and sense of willingness and/or urgency for information sharing.

Knowledge

- Knows how to tailor communication to a level appropriate for the intended audience.
- Knows techniques for clarifying misunderstandings.
- Understands that organizations differ in their information needs, priorities, and sense of willingness and/or urgency for information sharing.
- Understands that methods, technologies, and channels of communication differ across organizations (e.g., method of presentation, who shares information, how authority for information sharing is managed, how complete information must be to support decisions).
- Understands barriers to effective communications.
- Understands how much and the type of information to share with partners.
- Understands priorities, timelines, mission expectations, and other team members' plans and activities.
- Understands the components of active listening.

Skills

- Communicates effectively with broad audiences and external organizations.
- Communicates effectively with non-native speakers.
- Actively listens and responds to others, verifying information instead of assuming it was understood correctly.
- Demonstrates an understanding of others' comments and questions.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Able to inspire the acceptance of ideas requiring collaboration among diverse partners.
- Respectful of others when they are confused or make errors.
- Willing to take responsibility for communication flow.
- Willing to put aside personal pride to ensure mutual understanding.

Behavioral Indicators

- Conveys and describes facts or ideas in a clear, logical, and comprehensive manner, both orally and in writing.
- Fosters an atmosphere of open communication by encouraging others to share differing perspectives.
- Shares necessary information with partners in order to meet mission needs.
- Resolves discrepancies, confusions, and misunderstandings.
- Seeks information in a proactive manner.

3rd Meta-Competency: Collaborates to Solve Problems

Competency 10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving

Demonstrates the capacity to lead, plan, manage, or participate in a supporting role with individuals from foreign nations as well as with interagency counterparts, members of other services, and NGOs, in spite of differences in national/institutional cultures and processes.

Knowledge

- Understands the multifaceted nature of problems and how the different parts of a problem relate to one another.
- Understands mission and operational timelines.
- Understands the principles of goal-setting and motivation.
- Understands the relevant task requirements.
- Understands the different perspectives and needs that problem-solving partners contribute.
- Aware of the importance of considering each team member's constraints and responsibilities.
- Understands the roles and influences within the team or organization.
- Understands the importance of delegating tasks and empowering others.
- Understands how and when to involve team members in problem-solving.

Skills

- Reconciles competing viewpoints while remaining focused on the goals at hand.
- Applies the principles and techniques of time management.
- Considers all sides of the problem and chooses a method and/or combining steps from multiple methods to solve a problem effectively.
- Engages in iterative problem-solving in the absence of perfect solutions.
- Collaborates effectively in "virtual" as well as face-to-face environments.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Willing to change or augment preferred problem-solving method.
- Willing to question decisions and reapply a problem-solving process if necessary.
- Committed to persisting until a resolution is obtained.
- Able to recognize the need not to miss a critical step when under pressure.

Behavioral Indicators

- Leads, plans, and participates in a supporting role with foreign nationals, interagency counterparts, other service members, and NGOs.
- Develops and shares problem-solving methodologies.

Behavioral Indicators (continued)

- Delegates and empowers other team members.
- Develops plans with attainable milestones.
- Defines tasks and goals clearly.
- Clarifies team member roles and responsibilities.
- Assigns tasks according to capabilities and individual preferences.
- Assigns tasks with clearly defined goals.
- Mediates differences to reach acceptable and viable solutions.
- Involves team members in the problem-solving process as applicable.

Competency 11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals

Demonstrates the ability to harmonize tactical planning with operational objectives and strategic goals, accounting for the consequences of decisions and/or actions over time and across multiple levels and lines of operations.

Knowledge

- Understands the mission and operational timelines.
- Understands the factors that influence functioning or lead to contingencies and emergencies.
- Understands the consequences of not considering the impact of one's own plans, actions, and decisions on others.
- Understands the consequences of unclear or poorly defined goals.
- Understands there are conflicting time horizons across actors in the operation.
- Identifies discrepancies between conflicting data or information.
- Evaluates risks and benefits.
- Once a decision is executed, checks the outcome and compares it to prior expectations (risk/benefit estimate).

Skills

- Predicts what contingencies or situations might evolve from the current situation.
- Anticipates the consequences of decisions and/or actions over time and across multiple levels and lines of operation.
- Sees the "big picture," i.e., anticipates the implications of 2nd and 3rd order effects of plans and actions for one's own organization, as well as partner organizations.
- Engages in critical thinking.

Abilities/Attitudes

- Willing to adjust priorities, plans, and assignments.
- Willing to assume accountability.
- Committed to questioning one's own perceptions and experiences.

Behavioral Indicators

- Blends tactical actions with operational and strategic goals.
- Formulates objectives and priorities.
- Implements plans in conjunction with the efforts of many people, organizations, and communities.
- Capitalizes on opportunities and manages risks.

Competency 12: Applies available resources and expertise

Demonstrates the ability to cooperatively acquire and administer human, financial, material, and information resources to accomplish the mission.

Knowledge

- Identifies the resources and expertise in own and other organizations/entities that are needed to address coordinated goals.
- Understands the principles and techniques of time management.
- Understands each individual team member's strengths, weaknesses and professional capabilities.
- Determines and verifies what resources are needed.

Skills

- Aware of boundaries for action.
- Matches assets to the appropriate problems (not just those that are most salient to one's own organization).

Abilities/Attitudes

- Able to manage one's own expectations according to own boundaries.
- Committed to respecting team members' capabilities and preferences.
- Values expertise outside of traditional roles in the organization.

Behavioral Indicators

- Administers human, financial, material, and information resources to accomplish the mission.
- Delegates tasks and empowers individuals.
- Supports team members with resources and authority.
- Monitors the status of tasks and people.
- Develops workarounds when resources are constrained or barriers to access exist.
- Ensures team members have the appropriate tools and resources to complete tasks.
- Assigns tasks according to capabilities and individual preferences.

Appendix F

Decision Requirements for Civil-Military Teaming

Below is a list of 32 dilemmas and decision points encountered during CMT operations. These dilemmas and decision points were captured during detailed in-depth interviews. The subsequent content provides a description of the challenges, considerations, and problem-solving strategies associated with each dilemma/decision. The information is organized by task and decision to support identification of training requirements and gaps, and to focus scenarios.

- Build relationships across agencies, implementing partners, contractors, and military to support common interests
- Build trusting partnerships with host nation and multinational counterparts
- Navigate relationship dynamics and political challenges
- Adapt operations to align to changes in mission initiated by new leadership
- Investigate the rationale behind established plans and projects
- Determine who and how to help with programs, aid, and support
- Determine whether an area is a candidate for stability or development work
- Coordinate efforts to resolve issues to execute a task or project between agency, partner, sub-contractor, and military
- Develop situation awareness of the operational environment, situation on the ground, and project status
- Manage expectations of what, how, and when projects will be implemented
- Determine what type, how much, and how to share information with partners
- Negotiate information flow among agencies, implementing partners, subcontractors, and military
- Coordinate joint military operations
- Distinguish and track the different types of civilians and civilian organizations operating in theater
- Determine who the relevant players are that need to be integrated into operations
- Determine how to get started in a new assignment/location
- Determine how to integrate oneself with the Army
- Generate a picture of what success looks like
- Entice other actors (e.g., local, U.S. agency, military, NGO and international partners) into working together
- Gain consensus on mission priorities across U.S. agency and military partners
- Prioritize projects to implement
- Determine how to position/nest programs, goals, and activities with larger U.S. strategy in country
- Anticipate 2nd and 3rd order consequences of actions
- Develop an integrated civil-military campaign plan for a 3-5 year strategy
- Subtly train and coach counterparts
- Develop military's understanding of how civilian agencies function in capacity building and community development missions
- Create functioning civil-military working group

- Facilitate project planning, roles and assignments across agencies
- Assess the effects and impacts of development and capacity building
- Decide how best to work with local national counterpart
- Position host nation government to respond to various situations on the ground
- Coordinate operations across host nation counterparts, militaries, and multinationals

Task/Activity: Build and Manage Relationships

Dilemma/Decision: Build relationships across agencies, implementing partners, contractors, and military to support common interests

Challenges

- Reluctance of all parties to share information freely with others.
- Lack of immediate value seen in programs that partners are running.
- Leaders in a battle space may have personality clashes, leading to barriers for their respective teams when they try to work together.
- Some team members do not understand sharing credit for achievements or allowing others to have credit when it is helpful to the situation.
- Some military members view cooperation and collaboration as threatening to the chain of command.

Considerations

- Views on how to spend money or how to govern projects.
- Degree of familiarity each partner has with the other agencies, their missions, and current operations.
- Level of information on capabilities of agency partners.
- Degree to which others are amenable to coordinating and collaborating on and off the record.
- How civilians are integrated with the military in different battle spaces (i.e., some may receive better accommodations and resources based on the perceived value they add to the mission).

Problem-solving strategies

- Welcome counterparts into existing civilian, military, or cross-agency planning functions.
- Introduce counterparts to senior host nation political officials.
- Use collaboration and discussion to inform situational awareness and to lead to better, more informed decisions.

Problem-solving strategies (continued)

- Leverage networks and sources of information about the area.
- Serve as intermediary for the military to assist other civilian organizations.
- Introduce commanders to other commanders who have successfully leveraged civilian capabilities and let them confer peer-to-peer.
- Coordinate off the record during smoke breaks, meals, convoys.

Competencies

- Main competency
  - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose
- Supporting competency
  - C2: Cultural agility
  - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams

Dilemma/Decision: Build trusting partnerships with host nation and multinational counterparts

Challenges

- Prior assumptions and experiences may slow the process of forging trust.
- Some U.S. personnel are deployed strictly in an advising role without any decision-making authority.
- Military focus on kinetic action.
- The relationships with host nation personnel (e.g., security guards) may be a contractual and not a command, relationship.
- Host nation partners may be aiding the insurgents.
- Culture norm may be to assure compliance and then do it their way anyway.
- Host nation personnel may not take initiative, may not move forward with actions, or they may move slowly as a way to resist.
- Military culture follows established protocol; if something is not written in a manual, it is less likely to occur.
- One careless blunder can set back hard-won progress gained from establishing relationships.

Considerations

- Operational turnaround time.
- Planning cycle time constraints.
- Priority of mission.

Considerations (continued)

- Ability to put aside assumptions that interfere with partnering effectively with other cultures.
- Ability to put aside expectations and tolerate ambiguity in situations.
- Ability to exercise tactical patience.
- Level of understanding of culture in which you are operating.
- Ability to ask for advice.
- Level of in-depth cultural training (e.g., received in-depth vs. surface-level training).

Problem-solving strategies

- Identify the needs of host nation partners (e.g., a place to sit, take a break, pray or drink tea) and implement ways of addressing those needs (e.g., bunkers).
- Show genuine care for the well-being of host nation partners.
- Consider what motivates host nation partners (e.g., in Afghanistan, status, not money, is a driving force).
- Provide host nation partners with the opportunity to stand side-by-side with U.S. Soldiers (implies status and being treated as equals).
- Consider how host nation partners interpret actions based on norms of their culture (e.g., officers carry side arms, which are used to execute subordinates for doing a poor job).
- Understand that in some cultures, placing complete trust in host nation partners ensures honor - they will not betray that trust.
- Visit the areas where host nation partners work frequently so that they get used to U.S. personnel, their roles, and capabilities.
- Include host nation role players in training prior to deployment.
- Recognize the opportunity to help host nation partners build credibility and status (e.g., by being seen on patrols, or standing side-by-side guarding a gate).
- Set aside planning and prioritizing assumptions (i.e., that security, information, and chain of command are intact and working).
- Explain asset priorities to the other cultures and organizations in a way they can understand, taking into account cultural differences.
- Leverage National Guard and Reserve personnel (i.e., broader experiences can facilitate developing relationships with civilians and other partners).
- Learn some of local language.
- Make an effort to take meals with multinational partners, bring junior officers to experience a different culture, and learn how to relate to others.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C6: Develops positive relationships

- Supporting competencies
  - C2: Cultural agility
  - C3: Understands multiple perspectives
  - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Dilemma/Decision: Navigate relationship dynamics and political challenges

Challenges

- There may be no model to use as guidance (must start from scratch).
- Personnel may be too quick to make assessments (e.g., degree of corruption, where the enemy is operating from, who is deserving of resources).
- Some partners may move quickly and get work started without military assistance.
- Personnel may be asked to serve as intermediaries and messengers in politically sensitive situations (e.g., asking the local mayor to reschedule a press conference when the U.S. ambassador cannot attend).
- People may feel easily slighted instead of viewing friction as cross- organizational differences.
- Sensitivity to using same local HUMINT sources for multiple purposes by different actors.
- Players often have overlapping and conflicting roles.

Considerations

- Interests, motivations, reasons and ideological views on how things should run.
- Opinions across partners on effective use of resources.
- Viewpoints of how each actor fits into the U.S. policy in country.
- Who is authorized to make what decisions on behalf of the host nation government.
- Protocol/norms for communicating with political officials (e.g., is it acceptable to contact/email, who to copy on email).
- Styles and preferences of changing leadership.
- Each organization's mission, structure, and culture, including directives for how each organization should carry out its mission.
- Size, scope, and long-term impacts of programs and interventions.
- Perceived fairness and equality of programs and interventions implemented in the past.
- Credibility and competence of agency representatives.

Problem-solving strategies

- Implement a fair and equitable process (i.e., equal chance of everyone receiving assistance, minority tribes can lobby for support, everyone has a voice).
- Develop relationships with those in positions of authority so they can apply pressure to

others as needed.
- Write and share reports in a way that others can benefit from the work.
- Investigate the tone and directives established by each agency's senior leadership on how personnel execute the mission.
- Leverage organizational friendships to push project ideas.
- Write letters/emails to support other project efforts to gain consensus and solidarity around ideas.
- Keep abreast of logistics and standard operating procedures.

Competencies

- Main Competency
    - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams
- Supporting Competencies
    - C4: Understands capabilities of partners and systems
    - C9: Manages the flow of communication
    - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Task/Activity: Manage Programs and Projects

Dilemma/Decision: Adapt operations to align to changes in mission initiated by new leadership

Challenges

- Rotation of leaders fosters lack of continuity in mission focus or scope.
- Predecessors/successors may not be known by incumbent.
- Deployments may not overlap and allow for a "right seat ride."
- Personnel may be in different stages of their deployments; those going home may want to "wrap up" projects and gain a sense of completion, while others may want to continue the work.
- Those re-deploying are going to another job and may not have time for continued coordination with those still in country.

Considerations

- Different deployment cycles across agencies.
- Routine policy changes with new leadership can disrupt activities.
- Stages of project that are contingent on different actors each doing their part (changes to one actor's mission impacts all).
- Projects may be set up on assumption that the next person rotating in will have the same mission, directive, resources, and timeframe (not always the case).

Problem-solving strategies

- Take time to form an assessment of the current situation and be open-minded before implementing changes to existing missions.
- Listen to perspectives of subordinates.
- Investigate what actions have been conducted to ensure the correct subsequent actions are implemented.
- Make oneself available for questions, via email or phone to successors continuing the mission.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams
- Supporting competencies
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
    - C9: Manages the flow of communication

Dilemma/Decision: Investigate the rationale behind established plans and projects

Challenges

- Resource constraints may be a factor in deciding on plans and projects (e.g., agencies may be severely challenged in getting their people trained, qualified, and on the ground).
- Security issues/risks fall under a commander's purview; agencies may need to get out of an area.
- Belief by military that they have authority over everything in theater.

Considerations

- What may be a sustainable long term solution for locals may be different than that for Americans (e.g., making a building heating system contingent on expensive fuel, maintenance cost and maintenance skill vs. designing a building with wood burning stoves for easy and affordable maintenance).

Problem-solving strategies

- Verify with the locals and commander that the plans are what they want and need.
- Check assumptions and continually ask questions to probe why the civilian agency or locals are doing things the way they are.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C4: Understands capabilities of partners and systems
- Supporting competencies
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations

Dilemma/Decision: Determine who and how to help with programs, aid, and support

Challenges

- Need to overcome bad reputations, promises made that were not kept, or dissatisfaction with previous personnel.
- Inability to maintain a long time horizon instead of seeking more immediate solutions.
- Desire to support the most vulnerable populations may indirectly contribute to continued instability.
- Independent actions may result in unanticipated or unwelcome 2nd and 3rd order effects.
- True needs vs. wants may differ; local leaders may be motivated to ask for things that benefit them and their family personally, versus the community at large.

Challenges (continued)

- Locals may not know what solutions are possible for a given challenge (e.g., may be lacking knowledge about farming techniques, equipment, or resources needed).
- What the locals want/need may not be obvious from the Coalition's perspective.

Considerations

- Backgrounds, reputation, and positions of those in cross-functional working groups.
- Local networks and connections that those have in the working group.
- Level of tension between short term needs and long term mission goals.
- Knowledge of populations that are supporting the local government vs. those supporting insurgents.
- Who local key leaders are connected to by means of familial relationships (e.g., Taliban, government leaders).
- Whether local contacts and sources are being paid to provide information (shifting loyalties) or freely offering it.
- Existing resources and capabilities of local population.
- Amount of information locals can provide on their current situation.
- Differing or competing perspectives of locals, depending on situation.
- Security in area.
- Availability and reliability of implementing agents.

Problem-solving strategies

- Identify working groups and organizations to facilitate entry into communities.
- Identify number, type (local, U.S. only, international), and purpose of each NGO/IO.
- Obtain recommendations from others in country on where to obtain credible information.
- Co-locate field coordinators in close proximity to other agency partners and/or military.
- Set up frequent, recurring meetings to share information.
- Compare and contrast top priorities and populations with those of interest for military to support.
- Formulate and deploy assessment teams with local leaders as key players.
- Support battalion/combat units in kinetic areas by providing a local civilian or NGO partner to work through the government.
- Perform a cost benefit analysis of potential projects.
- Engage with the community to fully understand the environment or area (i.e., who are the key actors, what are the upcoming events, and so forth).

Competencies

- Main competency
  - C12: Applies available resources and expertise
- Supporting competencies
  - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
  - C4: Understands capabilities of partners and systems
  - C9: Manages the flow of communication
  - C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving
  - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals

Dilemma/Decision: Determine whether an area is a candidate for stability or development work

Challenges

- Difference between gathering "intel" and gathering atmospherics.
- May not have access to information about local population.
- Kinetic activity may be ongoing.
- Others may not understand the intention behind allocating resources in certain ways.
- Some insurgent leaders are in charge of "shaking down" NGOs.

Considerations

- Degree of corruption.
- What locals and leaders are discussing.
- Whether proposed program is something of interest to locals.
- Real needs of local community.
- Track record of results (i.e., programs tried in the past).
- Likelihood program will produce results based on structure, funding.
- Local view of the government.
- Whether safer for others to align with military or go in "neutral".
- Location of insurgent checkpoints.
- Military plans and goals.
- Capacity/capability of partners.

Problem-solving strategies

- Leverage NGOs to gather atmospherics on what is happening in a given area.
- Access fingerprints, demographic, and family history of all local nationals working for an NGO.

Problem-solving strategies (continued)

- Discern the temperament and loyalties of various villages and towns (e.g., Taliban, insurgents, sympathizers).
- Meet with military to gather information.
- Coordinate and share information with military counterparts.
- View situation as an opportunity to "shape" the battlefield.

Competencies

- Main Competency
  - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
- Supporting Competencies
  - C9: Manages the flow of communication
  - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
  - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Dilemma/Decision: Coordinate efforts to resolve issues to execute a task or project between agency, partner, sub-contractor, and military

Challenges

- Accomplishing a major goal (e.g., create 2,000 police officers, pull off elections) may take months or years.
- Command authority may be limited to those within a person's agency or unit.
- Ability to drive projects may be based on relationships and indirect influence.
- Corruption of project managers.

Considerations

- Environmental characteristics (e.g., populace, geography, history).
- Expectations, directives, timelines.
- Network of contacts.
- Level of project oversight.
- Cost concerns.
- Number of players coordinating.
- Level of commitment and dedication by the different parties.
- Level of insurgent activities.
- Level of corruption.

Problem-solving strategies

- Identify the key decision makers.
- Plan and map out the timeline and determine how to implement it.
- Prioritize tasks and sub-tasks according to the requirements of the mission.
- Provide frequent status updates as more information becomes available.
- Broker and negotiate deals to provide the most cost-effective solutions that satisfy all parties.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving
- Supporting competencies
    - C12: Applies available resources and expertise
    - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose

Dilemma/Decision: Develop situation awareness of the operational environment, situation on the ground, and project status

Challenges

- Time constraints inhibit obtaining full baseline of situation.
- Civilians are prohibited by law from collecting intelligence.
- Military may disregard valuable information gathered by non-intelligence personnel.
- Military may fail to grasp, appreciate, or leverage the access civilians have established in local communities.
- Disengaged agency POCs may be bottlenecks and warrant someone else stepping into management.
- Logistical issues involved with accessing information about what is happening on the ground or getting information from contractors and sub-contractors.
- Lack of information flow between contractors, agencies, and military.

Considerations

- Key actors, network of experts, and upcoming events in area.
- Willingness of partners to communicate and deconflict.
- Ability to speak the language of the military.
- Extent of partners' experience in project management.
- Awareness of long-term development goals.
- Investigative skills.
- Where to access information.

Considerations (continued)

- Ability to evaluate objectively the usefulness of information.
- Experience level of person receiving information.
- Volume of reports to sift through and filter.
- Ability to differentiate good information (i.e., accurate, credible) from actionable information.
- Level of detail as related to level of credibility.

Problem-solving strategies

- Triangulate information from a variety of sources to understand and assess credibility of other actors.
- Work across partners to form a combined/shared assessment.
- Make frequent site visits to get to know players involved (e.g., planners in country, host nation connections).
- Train civilians on military culture and differences between the Services.
- Volunteer to personally obtain information to facilitate assessment.
- Bring partners to meetings to help them gather firsthand information.
- Identify information gaps.
- Ask culturally appropriate questions (e.g., with Afghans, the more specific the better)
- Consider a source's position in the community, past experience, motivation in providing information.
- Leverage investigative skills to ascertain situation on the ground.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
- Supporting competencies
    - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose
    - C9: Manages the flow of communication
    - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Dilemma/Decision: Manage expectations of what, how, and when projects will be implemented

Challenges

- Locals may appreciate idea of long term projects, but more concerned with how to be productive, earn wages, and feed their families in the short term

Challenges (continued)

- "Bad guys" take advantage of gaps in timeline; their goal is to gain favor with locals to undermine the mission
- May be difficult to determine what resources are available

Considerations

- Time to get supplies to area in need.
- Time needed to realize benefits.
- Other supporting projects that need to be completed prior to completing main project.
- Degree to which other entities (NGOs, university personnel) can deliver smaller projects and programs to fill gaps.
- Degree to which one is able to construct an accurate mental model for what it takes to do x, y, or z.
- Availability of resources.

Problem-solving strategies

- Identify gaps and formulate bridging strategies.
- Learn what resources are available and the timelines for procurement.
- Develop contingency plans should projects become delayed.
- Convey timelines across different disciplines to ensure common understanding of situation and proposed solution.
- Make specific and immediate plans to aid locals in areas important to them (e.g., agriculture).

Competencies

- Main competency
  - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
- Supporting competencies
  - C4: Understands capabilities of partners and systems
  - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Task/Activity: Align and Integrate Operations

Dilemma/Decision: Determine what type, how much, and how to share information with partners

Challenges

- Language barriers, high illiteracy rates, and differing attention spans.
- Lines of communication may not be direct between civilians and military commanders.
- Commanders differ in how they involve, leverage, and utilize civilian and contractor assets.
- Local politics may change the rules during interventions.
- Constitutional limitations and laws may impede information sharing.
- Not sharing all information may violate trust.
- Traditional intelligence reports of enemy activity may not capture all details pertinent to civilian operational planning.
- What military considers a threat may not apply to civilians.
- Military and civilian operations may occur simultaneously in same area/ region, with different goals and objectives, so the information pertinent to different agencies may be different.

Considerations

- Different cultures, norms of operating, terminology, and planning cycles.
- Ability to translate classified information into a form that can be shared.
- Ability to present findings to different audiences (USAID, military, and so forth).
- Level of education/literacy of locals.
- How personnel are rewarded for sharing/not sharing information.
- Level of trust already established in key relationships.
- Credibility of sources providing information.
- Ability to categorize information into pieces that can and cannot be shared.
- Different norms, standards, and language for operating.
- Rationale behind historical enemy activity in the area.
- Goals and motivations of each actor in the area.
- Ability to interpret information received from different organizations.

Problem-solving strategies

- Communicate ideas by offering them as "recommendations."
- Share problems before they get out of control.
- Ask questions to verify information.
- Be sensitive to terminology (e.g., interrogation vs. law enforcement interview).

Problem-solving strategies (continued)

- Recognize that common/standard military and law enforcement techniques may be new to locals.
- Keep counterparts informed enough to motivate them to investigate and gather their own information.
- Build trust by providing credible information, even if it is not directly needed at the time (e.g., show/share UAV feeds).
- Establish working model of how each player typically performs his/her job.
- Identify what information is relevant and pertinent to the particular task.
- Be aware of who has access to the information you are seeking.
- Make it clear what pieces of information are critical vs. extraneous to mission.
- Share specific details about how assistance will be provided to partners.

Competencies

- Main competency
  - C9: Manages the flow of communication
- Supporting competencies
  - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose
  - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams
  - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals

Dilemma/Decision: Negotiate information flow among agencies, implementing partners, subcontractors, and military

Challenges

- Cultural differences in work styles impact expectations/relationships.
- Tendency for military to view civilians, contractors, and implementing partner as subordinates instead of as peers.

Considerations

- Level of understanding of cultural differences between different actors.
- Norms for acceptable work quality.
- Norms for how workers are hired and paid.
- Degree to which civilians can show value added to the military.
- Degree to which military are open to working with civilians as peers instead of assets/subordinates.

Problem-solving strategies

- Uncover and discuss cultural differences (norms, ways of working) in a way that all can understand.
- Educate the military about what civilians do and what role they play in executing the overall mission.
- Educate the military in the systems approach (interrelated systems that must function as a unified whole).

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C3: Understands multiple perspectives
- Supporting competencies
    - C2: Cultural agility

Dilemma/Decision: Coordinate joint military operations

Challenges

- Leadership of respective Services may believe they have command authority over one another.
- Common terms may have different definitions across Services (e.g., establish a perimeter, provide staffing for the perimeter).
- Counterparts fail to realize they have to protect each other, so cannot begin to start to work together.

Considerations

- Degree to which leadership is willing to work across services.

Problem-solving strategies

- Take the time to build a relationship with counterpart and find out how to support him/her.
- Determine what agreements, contracts, and memoranda of understanding have already been established.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams

Competencies (continued)

- Supporting competency
  - C4: Understands capabilities of partners and systems
  - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose

Task/Activity: Determine Roles and Responsibilities

Dilemma/Decision: Distinguish and track the different types of civilians and civilian organizations operating in theater

Challenges

- Common mindset of civilians that those in uniform are Warfighters.
- Misunderstandings and confusion about different roles and functions between agencies.
- Agencies report how many civilians/vehicles are planning to be in the area, but information may change in the last minute - out of military's control.
- Military may not know who the civilian agencies are and their roles in country.
- Many military have not had any experience working closely with non-military counterparts.
- Common mindset of military personnel is that all civilians are contractors who only care about making money.

Considerations

- Agencies vary on how they function and keep track of their personnel.
- Military intelligence procedures and how those overlap or complement work of contractors in country.

Problem-solving strategies

- Accurately create and maintain current list of all civil-military units or organizations working in theater.
- Contact various agencies to understand who they are working with and what projects they are working on.
- Explain to military what DoD civilians can do, how they differ from contractors, and the leverage they have over contractors to ensure quality control.
- Prior to deployment, provide personnel with some of the civil-military organizations that they will see in theater and inform them as to their roles.
- Implement in-theater training to reinforce who the players are.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C4: Understands capabilities of partners and systems
- Supporting competencies
    - C3: Understands multiple perspectives
    - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose

Dilemma/Decision: Determine who the relevant players are that need to be integrated into operations

Challenges

- Not all players are easily identifiable and accessible.
- The more players involved in the mission, the greater the security concerns.
- Civil-military organizations may be involved in various operations (e.g., elections).
- Military personnel at field grade level may not know the role of civilians.

Considerations

- Established partnerships with the military (e.g., Afghan Uniform Police, Border Police, Afghan Military Schools) vs. with civilians (e.g., force protection).
- Different contractors may be providing security services at different FOBs, but there are opportunities to link up, connect systems, and share information.

Problem-solving strategies

- Work to uncover the network of contractors at a location and across FOBs to determine responsibilities of each entity.
- Recognize that there may be multiple entities within the same organization that are important for coordination (e.g., one group of USACE engineers for building design; another group for security equipment placement).

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C4: Understands capabilities of partners and systems
- Supporting competencies
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
    - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams

Dilemma/Decision: Determine how to get started in a new assignment/location

Challenges

- Specific job roles may be unclear due to differences between agencies and organizations.
- Lack of clear links between the overall goal (e.g., advisors to the military) and the specific role(s).
- There may be little guidance from superiors or predecessors on mission, scope, and goals.
- Hand-offs from previous personnel may not occur.

Challenges (continued)

- It may take time to get bearings and a working understanding of the operational environment.
- Getting outside the wire or getting seats on a convoy may be difficult.

Considerations

- Plans/projects previous personnel managed and implemented while in country.
- Plans developed by local government entities or NGOs for the area of operations.
- Availability of insights from departing personnel on what they would have done differently at the beginning of their assignments.
- How information is filtered through different organizations.
- Leaders' level of initiative to research the area on their own.

Problem-solving strategies

- Form good relationships with local government leaders and coordinating bodies before taking major actions.
- Streamline communications from lower levels up to regional headquarters.
- Field questions and find answers to issues raised in the field.
- Research what existing plans have been developed by predecessors.
- Be flexible about where and how to best support the mission.
- Approach assignment with an open mind and without assuming you have all the answers (i.e., a learning stance).
- Before deployment, research the culture, language, etc.
- Start forming an approach in order to hit the ground running upon arrival.
- Maintain flexible attitude – be open to learning specifics once deployed (i.e., if approach not working, adapt it).
- Keep learning and updating mental models.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C2: Cultural agility
- Supporting competencies
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
    - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams
    - C6: Develops positive relationships

Dilemma/Decision: Determine how to integrate oneself with the Army

Challenges

- Getting outside the wire or getting a seat on the convoy may be difficult.
- Military may not see what value civilian agencies partners bring to the operation.
- Goals and objectives may differ across civilian and military partners (e.g., stability vs. development).
- Culture of the military is action-oriented and sometimes they just want to "do something."

Considerations

- Personality and leadership style across key players.
- Access to resources (e.g., funding, implementing partners, key leaders, information, equipment and supplies).
- Past or existing relationships across civilian-military counterparts may affect how players respond to new personnel.

Problem-solving strategies

- Identify civilians who are successful in working with military.
- Learn the military system as opposed to fighting it.
- Determine how to show your worth or bring a capability to the table.
- Be persistent in researching information and asking questions.
- Be willing to say "I don't know."
- Attend provincial and military briefings to understand operational situation.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
- Supporting competencies
    - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose
    - C8: Manages conflict

Task/Activity: Align Goals

Dilemma/Decision: Generate a picture of what success looks like

Challenges

- Conflict between finding local solutions to local problems vs. doing things the American way.
- Metrics are developed by those not working in the field - no understanding of what success looks like or factors involved.
- Unavailability of feedback because information is not always available after a deployment ends – prevents lessons learned.
- Personnel turnovers across agencies disrupt continuity and create turbulence.
- Each new rotating U.S. military unit brings new perspective and direction for operations.
- Competition for resources can turn deadly and corruption can occur.
- Rules can change politically during an intervention.
- Different sets of rules, political changes, and corruption can cause one to lose focus on successes.
- Activity standards may be widely understood (e.g., train 200 personnel) but desired end states are often unknown.
- Fractured infrastructure in country makes communication challenging.
- Some may be too concerned with the process and not with action or results or vice versa.

Considerations

- Strategic overall goals of the mission.
- Level of turbulence.
- Ability to present findings to different audiences (e.g., USAID, military).
- Commander's strategy, intent, and perspective.
- Differences in risk-taking (e.g., USMC more aggressive, willing to go make mistakes, spend money, and go on the offensive vs. Army more conservative).

Problem-solving strategies

- Discern different agendas, interests, and motivations of key players.
- Accept competition and corruption may be present, but focus on what goals were met.
- Describe local successes instead of blanket evaluation of entire country.
- Look for clues in reports on short-term goals that shed light on big picture goals.
- Interact with players involved to gain an understanding of their roles and mission requirements.
- Engage in mental simulation in order to generate a picture of what success looks like
- Respect the decision-making systems of the locals.

Competencies

- ▪ Main competency
  - o C4: Understands capabilities of partners and systems
- ▪ Supporting competencies
  - o C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
  - o C8: Manages conflict
  - o C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving
  - o C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals

Dilemma/Decision: Entice other actors (e.g., local, U.S. agency, military, NGO and international partners) into working together

Challenges

- ▪ Some players may be skeptical about what NGOs can deliver (scope and scale) and whether it is worth the time and effort to engage.
- ▪ U.S. entities may be concerned about moving too quickly or showing too much progress for fear that things are not controlled or are corrupt.
- ▪ Agencies may control or restrict access to NGO partners or military.
- ▪ NGOs must provide aid while being non-threatening to insurgents.
- ▪ NGO survival depends on developing relationships and trust with the community; if the military is seen working with them, that will undermine trust and make them a target for insurgents (and the military can inadvertently destroy the dynamic the NGOs have taken years to develop with the community).

Considerations

- ▪ Track records, experience levels, and reputations of partners.
- ▪ Financial resources and capacity of the program.
- ▪ Effort and resources partners will have to expend to make it worth their time to engage.
- ▪ Amount of latitude agencies have in approving projects (contract vs. cooperative agreement).
- ▪ Kinetic activity in the area.
- ▪ Degree to which civilians and military can work out conditions of how to operate together without threatening the others' mission.

Problem-solving strategies

- ▪ Leverage anyone who is willing to talk and share connections in communities and villages.
- ▪ Approach local elders/leaders to gauge interest and gain buy-in on projects.

Problem-solving strategies (continued)

- Demonstrate capabilities with high impact, short term projects.
- Provide locals with immediate aid such as training and equipment.
- Make clear that programs are not handouts but short term assistance toward locals being self-sufficient.
- Recognize when the military should keep their distance from civilians so as not to make them a target.
- Civilians must balance their need for protection by the military with the need to maintain distance (e.g., following a mile behind a convoy).

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
- Supporting competencies
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
    - C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving
    - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Dilemma/Decision: Gain consensus on mission priorities across U.S. agency and military partners

Challenges

- The indigenous definition of success (what the locals want) and what the agencies want to provide are sometimes in opposition to one another.
- Multinational partners may have competing interests and priorities about where to offer aid and services (e.g., schools and clinics).
- Quality standards and metrics of success may not apply in wartime situations.
- Military addresses symptoms and not causes of instability.
- Civilian focus is on long-term objectives involving less action, less use of visible resources, and more use of mental resources.
- No good rules of thumb exist for estimating cost of development mission with expected benefit and return in reducing insurgency.
- Risking military casualties for unknown returns may be unacceptable to the military.
- Unintended and unforeseen consequences for locals when implementing projects (e.g., electric power encourages Taliban to continue operating at night and prevents locals from leaving their homes).
- Activities performed in silos or pursued independently by the military (e.g., providing toys, clothes, food) may support a short term goal but create unintended consequences.

Challenges (continued)

- Funding for USAID programs is based on a proposal and bid cycle a year in advance, fraught with uncertainty whether projects will get approved or renewed.
- Military may not have an opportunity to weigh in on the funding process on which areas have strategic importance.
- Agencies may not be able to share details about proposed projects in order to protect the integrity of the procurement process.

Considerations

- Different goals and objectives across partners (e.g., stability vs. development).
- Past civil-military relationships affect how players respond to one another.
- Personality and leadership styles across key players.
- Degree of military understanding of capacity building.
- Systemic organizational differences between military and civilian worlds.
- Degree to which players see projects as long-term development vs. short-term solutions to problems.
- Willingness of the parties to come together and deconflict.
- Willingness of military to let civilians address causes of instability.
- Level of coordination in place at higher levels for both military and civilians.
- Type of mission each entity is planning/running in the area.
- Goals and motivations of each actor in the area.
- Level of awareness of different perspectives of the parties involved.
- Funding cycles of sponsoring organization.
- Level of understanding of how each organization operates, what their timelines are, the network they are in, and the key players involved.
- Level of awareness of the local perspective.

Problem-solving strategies

- Clarify how proposed actions are in support of stability or development goals.
- Train military understanding of how civilian agencies operate.
- Define clear-cut responsibilities for civilians and military so they do not step on each other's toes.
- Link strategies and goals by sending the information up to the embassy and senior commands, so they can integrate elements.
- Encourage joint civilian and military coordination at planning stage.
- Seek support of local community decision-making groups – it will be difficult for others to disregard the voice of a locally organized entity.
- Translate information into a common shared format that can be compared and understood.

Problem-solving strategies (continued)

- Make salient the long-term benefits to be derived from your project.
- Research other agencies' progress and status reports published online prior to meeting with them.
- Investigate and obtain development plans that have already been established or negotiated with the local population.
- Listen to what local experts have to say and be open to their perspectives.
- Leverage the situation to make others look good, which will increase support from them.
- Take into account the local perspective.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose
- Supporting competencies
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
    - C9: Manages the flow of communication
    - C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving
    - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
    - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Dilemma/Decision: Prioritize projects to implement

Challenges

- Requires saying "no" to some requests.
- Not all projects can be completed during one's deployment.
- Not all interventions work in every region or area.
- Having to deal with people who don't agree on the first steps, but who want things done a specific way.
- Working within what the security situation will safely allow.
- There may be corruption on the part of those with a vested interest in what and where projects happen.

Considerations

- Level of awareness of motives, agendas, and possible corruption.
- Scope of proposed projects.
- Resource constraints.
- Timeline constraints.

Considerations (continued)

- Location of proposed projects.
- Locals' desire for projects and solutions.
- Whether results will help build trust and confidence.
- Whether actions support long term sustainability.
- Feasibility of delivering and transitioning project successfully to those who follow in deployment.
- Whether the projects are in support of development or stability missions, as these have different objectives and timeframes associated with them.

Problem-solving strategies

- Think through 2nd and 3rd order effects.
- Align projects to existing plans or government requests.
- Consider what locals will consider as indicators of governance.
- Explore rationale behind requests (e.g., location of planned resources) to expose possible corruption.
- Be willing to "run a bluff" if others believe you are the decision maker.
- Find resources by re-purposing or looking outside your organization.
- Distinguish between elements that U.S. can sustain and those U.S. cannot.
- Be willing to take exploratory steps.
- Develop immediate actions and simultaneously plan for longer term.
- Build on existing programs/projects.
- Leverage personnel across the civil-military team who are trained in assessing infrastructure.

Competencies

- Main competency
  - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
- Supporting competencies
  - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
  - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Dilemma/Decision: Determine how to position/nest programs, goals, and activities with larger U.S. strategy in country

Challenges

- Different development partners may have differing views on their ultimate purpose in country (e.g., relieving suffering and helping the most vulnerable people vs. building an infrastructure and a more stable world).
- There is no chain of command across organizations.
- USAID personnel may not want to share everything that their implementing partners (NGOs) are doing with the military in order to try and keep them more safe/secure.

Considerations

- Degree of stability in country.
- Degree of security in country.
- Different people, with different organizations, and different government entities with their own philosophies or agendas.
- Size of program/amount of funding.
- Understanding of what is essential for the success of a COIN operation.
- Experience level of NGOs in implementing similar programs.
- Source of funding (e.g., USAID, other government entity vs. private donors).
- Potential of program to affect what portion of the population.

Problem-solving strategies

- Keep in mind the high-level U.S. strategy in country across military, DoS, USAID, etc.
- Coordinate plan across civilians and military on how to influence the local population to meet goals.
- Tie activities to host nation government plans.
- Word agency agenda in terms of military goals and vice versa.
- Utilize local/host nation employees to make activity visible and put a "local" face on it.
- Coordinate activities through leaders and other bodies (e.g., district governor, District Development Assembly).
- Seek an audience with a military counterpart to share information, plans, and capabilities and coordinate and deconflict activities.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals

Competencies (continued)

- Supporting competencies
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
    - C8: Manages conflict
    - C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving

Dilemma/Decision: Anticipate 2nd and 3rd order consequences of actions

Challenges

- A person may not be in country long enough to see the effects of a decision play out.
- U.S. personnel (both civilian and military) may be more heavily evaluated on immediate goals and progress made, despite long-term consequences.
- Lack of understanding of drivers of conflict (i.e., only looking at the immediate causes instead of engaging in systems level thinking).

Considerations

- Degree organizational cultures may reinforce long-term vs. short-term perspectives.
- Metrics of success (i.e., what is actually being measured vs. what should be measured).
- Degree to which military personnel understand the cultural implications of their actions.
- Understanding of the difference between capacity and capability.
- Ability to understand cultural dynamics (i.e., military is mission-focused; other cultures may be people-focused).

Problem-solving strategies

- Establish metrics that measure outcomes (i.e., end results), not just activities (e.g., dollars spent, number of personnel trained).
- Require a pre-deployment course for military on *Development Theory*.
- Place immediate needs in the context of long-term ultimate goal.
- Train systems thinking early in military careers, integrating an understanding of the drivers of conflict and lessons learned.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
- Supporting competencies
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
    - C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving

Dilemma/Decision: Develop an integrated civil-military campaign plan for a 3-5 year strategy

Challenges

- Civilians lack understanding of how to provide guidance to military.
- Military complains about lack of guidance from civilians, but when they obtain guidance, they often don't know how to leverage it.
- Military is trained to take action and shape the battlefield, so creating a multi-year strategy is new to them.
- Military may not understand the cultural context of the environment, thereby letting the enemy gain the advantage.

Considerations

- How well the planners on both sides communicate with one another.
- Assets and resources available across the civil-military team.
- Level of civilian understanding of the military culture.
- Level of military understanding of the cultural context.

Problem-solving strategies

- Civilian planners must communicate their intent, in military terms, to military planners.
- The embassy must establish an integrated civil-military planning and assessment capacity.
- Ensure ambassador and military commander sign off on the agreed-upon campaign plans.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C3: Understands multiple perspectives
- Supporting competencies
    - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose

Task/Activity: Educate Partners

Dilemma/Decision: Subtly train and coach counterparts

Challenges

- Personnel may not be receptive to education and training efforts.
- Inexperienced military need help learning how to use available assets to solve problems.
- Young military leaders may have a sense of pride that they can do everything themselves.
- Young military leaders in technical areas may be taught more about leadership than about their technical specialty.

Considerations

- Level of experience military personnel have in their roles.
- Openness and willingness to learning new ways.
- Availability of mentors.
- Willingness to ask for and accept assistance from others.

Problem-solving strategies

- Seek opportunities to help, but where others will not feel as if someone is trying to take over.
- Subtly ask questions to draw partner's attention to a particular concern.
- Paint a picture of what to look for and how the situation may unfold.
- Step in firmly when lack of knowledge will impact the mission.
- Identify mentors and emulate their actions and habits.
- Look for opportunities to educate the commander/staff on value provided.

Competencies

- Main competencies
    - C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving
- Supporting competencies
    - C2: Cultural agility
    - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams
    - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose

Dilemma/Decision: Develop military's understanding of how civilian agencies function in capacity building and community development missions

Challenges

- Differences in understanding what constitutes a campaign plan.
- Military's short-term focus and action-orientation vs. years it takes to develop government capacity.
- Asking village elders may not be sufficient for determining needs vs. wants (e.g., proximity of key local leaders' and their families' houses to planned project sites vs. needs of community as a whole).
- Lack of civilian doctrine/standard.
- DoD develops national level policy; foreign service officers are not trained in how to extrapolate and interpret policies at the regional, provincial, or district levels.
- Civilian resources pale in comparison to military.
- Civilian structure may not be consistent across regions.
- Characteristics of how the civilian agencies function (i.e., often as program managers, and without the ability to respond to specific requests for information).
- Implementing partners may have information about specific areas that may not be collected or filtered up to the agency partner.

Considerations

- Amount and type of training military members received on developing tactical patience and taking a long-term view.
- Understanding of important and relevant drivers of conflict.
- Differences in information flow and management.
- Whether commander's past experience with agencies was positive or negative.

Problem-solving strategies

- Train and synchronize the three lines of effort in COIN - security, governance, and development - for both the civilians and the military.
- Investigate and dig for information and connections that can explain motivations and why locals request certain assistance.
- Train military in understanding how the civilian platform operates, what information requirements they need, and why.
- Provide clear understanding of other's goals and roles in the overall effort.
- Advise military on best way to obtain information about an area (e.g., put together an assessment team) if/when requests for information overwhelm civilian agency counterpart or counterpart is too slow to respond.

Competencies

- Main competency
  - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
- Supporting competencies
  - C3: Understands multiple perspectives
  - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams

Task/Activity: Create Integrated Civil-Military Team

Dilemma/Decision: Create functioning civil-military working group

Challenges

- Working groups may duplicate work efforts.
- Framework civilians use (e.g., assess, act, and adapt) is not linear, but iterative.
- Civilians are more process-oriented than military.
- Long-established entities view new structures or coordinating mechanisms as unwanted interference.
- Many commanders view their jobs as keeping civilians out of harm's way, which can prevent civilians from doing their jobs.
- Failure of military to see long-term goals (i.e., for the region to be peaceful and safe for civilians to work in, and for military to leave FOB without armor or loaded weapons).

Considerations

- Ability/authority of facilitator to bring diverse groups together.
- Ability and willingness of the parties to communicate and coordinate.
- Resources and information each party brings to the table.
- Access to places and people that other entities do not have.
- Degree parties are able to view collaboration as beneficial (i.e., gaining an advocate for their purpose and mission).
- Recognition that development planning is contingent on interaction with locals.
- The particular commander's view or bias regarding what the role of the military should be in working with civilians.
- The ability of the commander to engage in system-level thinking.

Problem-solving strategies

- Seek out opportunities to deconflict.
- Introduce members of working group to host nation political officials so that they may build relationships.
- When military is not allowed to work in an area, they must leverage their relationships with civilian counterparts.
- Highlight each partner's strengths and abilities.
- Align working group responsibilities and activities to the requests being made by local officials.
- Identify constituencies that are not represented and invite them to participate (e.g., donors, culture office).

Problem-solving strategies (continued)

- Include an educational component in each meeting (inform others of the different capabilities of the different organizations).
- Ensure meeting times, locations, and agenda are consistent (i.e., set standards for regular communication and coordination).
- Push back resistance by proactively defining and developing roles and responsibilities.

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C8: Manages conflict
- Supporting competencies
    - C7: Builds common ground and shared purpose
    - C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving

Dilemma/Decision: Facilitate project planning, roles and assignments across agencies

Challenges

- Lack of available funding for projects.
- Corruption of local government officials impedes planning and progression of projects - entities cancel as a result.
- Communications are often one-way, from lower levels to regional.
- Lower levels can overwhelm regional levels with requests for information.
- Coordination and cooperation may not be as attractive to one organization as it is to another.
- Risk involved in coordinating operations may be too high for one partner to accept.
- The process for approval may be long and tedious (e.g., USAID has to go through D.C. and must be planned a year in advance).

Considerations

- Level of ease getting off base to do assessments and attend meetings.
- Degree agencies contract the work that needs to be done vs. completing it themselves.
- Timing impacts the success of the project.
- Amount and type of information requested.
- Ability to find technical experts who can provide the requested information.
- Personnel available to integrate operations.
- Resources available (e.g., UAVs).
- Permission to fly UAVs in restricted airspace.

Problem-solving strategies

- Conduct bi-weekly meetings to discuss details/address issues.
- Meet with local government officials to create a sense of legitimacy.
- Generate broad support for funding request prior to formal evaluation.
- Leverage political relationships to exert pressure on uncooperative counterparts.
- Utilize windows of opportunity of newly elected government officials to help build credibility.
- Locate specialists at the local level which will take workload off the regional level.
- Set up a fair, equitable, and transparent process for locals to lobby for support.
- Show metrics and evaluation data to convince others to participate.

Competencies

- Main competency
  - C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving
- Supporting competencies
  - C9: Manages the flow of communication
  - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
  - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Task/Activity: Measure Success

Dilemma/Decision: Assess the effects and impacts of development and capacity building

Challenges

- Time horizons differ between military and civilians.
- Difficult to gather data from locals on their sentiment toward local government
- Survey data can be fabricated.
- Activities and effort are easier to measure than outcomes or lasting impacts.
- Monitoring and assessing is resource intensive and the military is loathe to take any resources away from combat capacity.
- Measuring these types of outcomes is inherently difficult.
- The military understands effects-based monitoring but their focus is on battlefield damage, not development or stability.
- Agencies must show data on effects to drive "political sentiment" to leverage and influence the powers that be.

Considerations

- Local population sentiment towards the government.
- Landscape (urban, rural).
- Populations degree of education.
- Recognition by populace of government officials (visibility).
- Recognition by populace that the government is behind key programs or progress.
- Populace perceptions of fair and equitable processes.
- Local beliefs that government should provide support, education, and so forth.
- Level of agreement on what the end state is, among various parties.
- Level of understanding of the role the military plays in building local govt. capacity.
- Willingness of parties to pay attention to feedback from the community on how well interventions are meeting short- and long-term objectives.
- Ability to work at both the strategic and operational levels.

Problem-solving strategies

- Measure level of violence and insurgent activity over time in areas where programs are implemented.
- Balance reporting activities (numbers of people trained, amount of aid handed out) with long term effects.
- Understand the culture of the people and other organizations.
- Be willing to take risks, and be willing to get out there and implement side-by-side assistance.

Problem-solving strategies (continued)

- Gather project-specific information in terms of quality control.
- Check project-specific goals against longer-term stability objectives.
- Recheck progress toward overall mission and goals on a regular basis.
- Stay informed via "feedback loops" (assessing environment day-to-day).
- Keep overall mission goals in mind, i.e., if the whole goal is to support government legitimacy, *how* a project is implemented is more important than *what* is done.

Competencies

- Main competency
  - C2: Cultural agility
- Supporting competency
  - C11: Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals
  - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Task/Activity: Manage U.S. Presence

Dilemma/Decision: Decide how best to work with local national counterpart

Challenges

- Uncertainty whether the person you are working with has the support of others.
- Security concerns for counterpart, since he and his family may be a target of insurgents.
- Counterpart may not have adequate resources to make an impact.

Considerations

- Goals of counterpart.
- Information counterpart needs.
- Willingness of counterpart to learn new ways of doing things.
- Skills counterpart needs to build.
- Current level of security in the environment.

Problem-solving strategies

- Meet with counterpart on a regular basis, engaging in a variety of conversations (i.e., build a relationship with counterpart).
- Make introductions with other key players to establish credibility of counterpart.
- Provide security, if necessary.
- Provide coaching on how to request assistance from various USG entities.
- Present precise facts and not promises of what can be done.
- Introduce important players to counterpart and allow them to discuss project matters.
- Provide suggestions on what to do, but do not force the issue (e.g., to communicate with military, use a map).

Competencies

- Main competency
  - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
- Supporting competencies
  - C2: Cultural agility
  - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams

Dilemma/Decision: Position host nation government to respond to various situations on the ground

Challenges

- Members of some cultures or organizations lack confidence in host nation government to provide necessary resources.
- Host nation government may lose face if perceptions of progress are credited to coalition forces.

Considerations

- Extent to which locals have confidence that the government can meet their needs.
- Extent to which the government has not been viewed as a destructive force by the locals.
- Level of understanding of how to motivate people of other cultures.

Problem-solving strategies

- Assist local government in responding to local needs to increase confidence in government.
- Assist government in establishing and maintaining security.
- Use natural gathering place (e.g., the market) to leverage relationships of those who can help spread the word.
- Demonstrate success in an information operations campaign.
- Make sure the governor is attached to success (i.e., give credit to locals).
- Educate local commander's staff to take initiative, (i.e., it is their job to collect the data, analyze the data, and make recommendations to inform commander's decisions).

Competencies

- Main competency
    - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams
- Supporting competencies
    - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
    - C3: Understands multiple perspectives
    - C6: Develops positive relationships
    - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Dilemma/Decision: Coordinate operations across host nation counterparts, militaries, and multinationals

Challenges

- Failure to realize it may be unreasonable to expect others to fully adapt to American military way of doing things (e.g., Afghan locals work 4-5 hours/day, take frequent breaks for prayers).
- U.S. military has technology and resources at its disposal that counterparts may not and will not have once U.S. leaves.
- International agencies do not work with the same requirements as U.S. agencies (i.e., demonstrating a sense of urgency to accomplish the intended mission may not alter the tradition of the International agency going to the coffee shop before discussing the issue at hand).
- Other organizations and cultures keep track of operations differently than Americans (e.g., tendency to track the destination of a convoy versus the last known reported location or point of departure; not writing things down but keeping track in one's head and through verbal reports).
- Locals know terrain so well that they report location by terrain feature without giving coordinates.
- Each time a new unit comes into an area of operation, they bring their own new goals, new knowledge and new structure or way of doing things; Local nationals and others there for the long-term recognize this and it can affect how willing they are to jump on to the new way of operating.

Considerations

- Differences in work ethics and work styles across cultures.
- Ability to perform multiple tasks at the same time in order to accomplish mission's goals.
- Willingness to adapt to other work styles (i.e., conduct early morning meetings vs. later meetings, take coffee breaks throughout the day).
- Determining when to take action to show results vs. allowing a process to develop that includes everyone in creating the results.
- Leadership goals for other organizations (e.g., Afghan Army measures success differently).
- Different tactics work in different situations, depending on desired immediate vs. long-term results.

Problem-solving strategies

- Implement and enforce rules to encourage workers to be punctual.
- Provide stakeholders with daily status updates on progress.

Problem-solving strategies (continued)

- Purchase new technology to assist in security efforts (i.e., devices that detect contact with explosives).
- Meet with different heads of the political parties.
- Work with liaison teams, monitoring teams, Intel groups, and psychological operations.
- Develop friendships with individuals from other organizations.
- Attend meetings of agencies and note the information shared.
- Acknowledge pace and work style of counterparts and be willing to adjust own style as necessary (i.e., use breaks to get to know others).
- Utilize the same techniques as the locals or other organization with whom you are working (i.e., use maps instead of GPS) or modify procedures to account for how others can manage operations independently.
- Talk to local people and organizations directly to gather information instead of using the internet to search for information.
- Investigate what is stopping the others from taking initiative to help themselves vs. just taking direction from Americans.
- Walk through the plan with your sponsoring POC and/or request help in communicating/sharing purpose and authority of your program with other partners.

Competencies

- Main competency
  - C10: Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving
- Supporting competencies
  - C1: Understands the cultural context of situations
  - C2: Cultural agility
  - C5: Establishes effective partnerships and teams
  - C12: Applies available resources and expertise

Appendix G

Comparison of Competency Model to Other Recent Studies

Markel et al. (2011): Five key KSAs and their relevant CMT competencies

Markel et al. KSA	Description	Relevant CMT Competencies
General Interpersonal Skills	The ability to build and maintain relationships, positive rapport, and mutual trust, which are essential in making counterparts more willing to support requests.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1) Cultural agility (C2) Understands multiple perspectives (C3) Establishes effective partnerships and teams (C5) Develops positive relationships (C6)
Knowledge of Other Government Agencies' Capabilities, Culture, and Processes	Knowledge of other government agencies' capabilities, cultures and processes, which increase dramatically in importance at senior levels. Such knowledge tends to be the largest element of differences between the JIIM domains.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1) Understands multiple perspectives (C3) Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4)
Knowledge of Other Services' Capabilities, Culture, and Processes	Knowledge of other services' capabilities, cultures and processes, each requiring different combinations of knowledge, skills, and abilities. This finding contrasts significantly with the current joint qualification system, which treats all four of the JIIM domains essentially in the same way.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1) Understands multiple perspectives (C3) Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4)
Communication Skills	Practitioners accumulate and present facts, assumptions, and conclusions in an orderly, logical manner, which are required in every domain, at every echelon.	Builds common ground and shared purpose (C7) Manages the flow of communication (C9)
Conflict Resolution and Negotiation Skills	Brings others together to reconcile differences, as well as to persuade others to change their minds or behavior.	Understands multiple perspectives (C3) Builds common ground and shared purpose (C7) Manages conflict (C8) Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10)

Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory (2009): 10 best practices and their relevant CMT Competencies.

Johns Hopkins Best Practices	Description	Relevant CMT Competencies
Get the Right People on the Team	Understands the capabilities of the team before committing to a force structure that may not be appropriate for the task.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1) Establishes effective partnerships and teams (C5) Builds common ground and shared purpose (C7) Applies available resources and expertise (C12)
Establish Good External Communications	Cross-cultural communication skills and understanding different negotiating techniques for different situations.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1) Cultural agility (C2) Manages the flow of communication (C9) Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11)
Practice Cross-Cultural Communications	Practices patience and a willingness to listen to points of view unlike one's own.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1) Understands multiple perspectives (C3)
Keep Good Records	Knowledge-management practices to maintain continuity and help train new team members.	Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4) Applies available resources and expertise (C12)
Understand and Leverage Partner Capabilities and Expertise	Recognizes when one is outside own area of expertise, and a willingness to locate an expert from another agency with the necessary qualifications and experience.	Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4) Establishes effective partnerships and teams (C5) Applies available resources and expertise (C12)
Provide Adequate Resources	Provides adequate resources to interagency teams, making this a first and most important priority.	Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4) Applies available resources and expertise (C12)

Johns Hopkins Best Practices	Description	Relevant CMT Competencies
Manage Resources Effectively	Negotiating, evaluating contractors, managing programs and funding, developing contracts and budgets, vetting and incorporating interpreters, and managing project turnover.	Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10) Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11) Applies available resources and expertise (C12)
Break Down Barriers to Information Sharing	Promoting collaborative platforms to foster sharing of knowledge, managing collaborative actions, and sustaining communities of interest.	Builds common ground and shared purpose (C7) Manages conflict (C8) Manages the flow of communication (C9) Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10)
Tailor Leadership Style to the Networked Team	Tailoring leadership style to different types of teams, to include direct, non-traditional, informal, and internal leadership styles.	Cultural agility (C2) Builds common ground and shared purpose (C7) Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10)
Establish Personal Working Relationships	Establishes personal working relationships, which plays a key role in interagency collaboration, especially when chain of command, roles, and resources are not clearly defined.	Establishes effective partnerships and teams (C5) Develops positive relationships (C6) Builds common ground and shared purpose (C7)

Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS): Essential tasks and their relevant CMT competencies.

S/CRS Essential Tasks	Description	Relevant CMT Competencies
Advises	Provides guidance, recommendations, information, and technical expertise for USG interventions, collaborating with non-USG actors, and supporting host-nation capacity building.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1) Cultural agility (C2) Understands multiple perspectives (C3) Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4) Establishes effective partnerships and teams (C5) Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10) Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11)
Assesses	Employs various tools and methodologies to collect information, analyze, and draw conclusions to inform, initiate, or modify courses of action and ensure that goals or objectives are achieved.	Manages the flow of communication (C9) Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10) Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11) Applies available resources and expertise (C12)
Coordinates	Organizes the efforts of various stakeholders to avoid duplication of efforts, counterproductive activities, and gaps in addressing critical elements of the environment.	Develops positive relationships (C6) Builds common ground and shared purpose (C7) Manages conflict (C8) Manages the flow of communication (C9) Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10) Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11)
Evaluates	Monitors processes and activities and/or measures actual effects and progress towards desired objectives.	Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10) Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11) Applies available resources and expertise (C12)

S/CRS Essential Tasks	Description	Relevant CMT Competencies
		Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4)
Implements	Designs, conducts, and manages activities in accordance with USG policies, objectives, and plans.	Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10)
		Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11)
		Applies available resources and expertise (C12)
Manages	Creates and maintains the capabilities of the Civilian Response Corps to perform its mission.	Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10)
		Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11)
		Applies available resources and expertise (C12)
Plans	Understands a situation, identifies goals and objectives, develops courses of action, allocates resources, integrates activities in space and time, and evaluates progress towards goals.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1)
		Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving (C10)
		Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11)

Building Partnership Capacity: 21 foundational skills for building partner capacity and their relevant CMT competencies

BPC Foundational Skills	Description	Relevant CMT Competencies
1. Cultural Awareness	Cultural awareness is knowledge of the set of distinctive features of a society or group, including but not limited to values, beliefs, and norms, that ties together members of that society or group and drives action and behavior.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1) Cultural agility (C2) Understands multiple perspectives (C3)
2. Language diversity	Develop or increase confidence in learning and applying language skills.	None
3. Using Interpreters	Effective communication with local counterparts is critical to the success of any mission or project, particularly in regions of elevated conflict. For any team working abroad, the role of the interpreter is key to overcoming not only language barriers, but also to help bring cross-cultural understanding and empathy with local populations and their leaders. Training should equip practitioners with the best practices for working effectively with interpreters.	Cultural agility (C2) Understands multiple perspectives (C3)
4. Stability Operations	This training introduces U.S. Army doctrinal concepts related to stability operations. It examines the scope and complexity of stability in full spectrum operations by addressing essential stability tasks, planning for stability operations, and the interaction between tactical units and provincial reconstruction teams (PRT). Provides a deeper understanding of current U.S. stability doctrine and the complex problems that face Soldiers in today's operations.	Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11)
5. Organizational Development	Addresses development of effective teams to accomplish missions, communicating intent and purpose statements, and developing partners through developmental counseling.	Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4) Establishes effective partnerships and teams (C5) Develops positive relationships (C6) Builds common ground and shared purpose (C7)

BPC Foundational Skills	Description	Relevant CMT Competencies
6. Information Operations	Addresses current capabilities, principles, and intent of the Army's information construct. Field Manual 3-0, Chapter 7, "Information Superiority" lays out the new Army construct and the focus of information engagement.	None
7. Operational Environment	Develop understanding of design and the contemporary operational environment, the strategic environment, and the likely impact of threats, challenges, and opportunities in the international security environment. Covers the impact of the contemporary operational environment on today's military and its employment throughout the full spectrum of operations by analyzing the likely impact of threats, challenges, and opportunities in the international security environment, and analyzing the changing world strategic environment.	Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11)
8. Negotiations	Addresses bargaining and negotiating skills to succeed in the contemporary operational environment with special emphasis on the areas of interpersonal and inter-group conflict, interpersonal influence techniques, and the tactics and strategies involved with improved bargaining and negotiation. Develop insight into their personal negotiating styles and how to become more effective negotiators and more astute observers of the negotiation process.	Manages conflict (C8)
9.U.S. Interagency Capabilities	BPC planners and personnel need to better understand role of interagency partners. Training should address organizations, roles, functions, and capabilities of various U.S. Government (USG) agencies and non-government and international actors. Also address the cultural differences within the Department of Defense, a planning centric organization, with other USG departments that operate with 804 less formal and hierarchical structures than DOD. It should also describe some of the existing and evolving structures and processes for a comprehensive approach to dealing with events.	Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4)

BPC Foundational Skills	Description	Relevant CMT Competencies
10. Communications and Rapport	Develops the competency to use interpersonal influence to extend influence beyond chain of command. Addresses being able to build trust outside lines of authority; understanding sphere, means, and limits of influence; and negotiating, building consensus, and resolving conflict.	Understands multiple perspectives (C3) Establishes effective partnerships and teams (C5) Develops positive relationships (C6) Manages conflict (C8)
11. Understanding Media	Provides the foundational tools for understanding the relationship between the military and the media, developing media plans, and preparing for media interviews. Includes the role of the individual when interacting with the media, guidelines for speaking with the media, development of command messages, and preparing for a media interview. Develops the competencies required to deal with the media throughout a military career.	None
12. Understanding Reform	Addresses reform as a concept and its use in pre-conflict and post-conflict environments. Presents reform as a holistic enterprise in which various sectors of government and society work together to enhance their society's ability to address conflict when it rises before violence is used. Reform as a means to identify more effective systems that allow various government structures to provide services to the population equitably and systematically. Teaches to identify and engage local partners including targets of change and agents of change and to work productively together toward reform.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1) Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C2) Applies available resources and expertise (C12)
13. Spoilers and Drivers of Conflict	Original and emerging drivers of conflict and spoilers that may undermine BPC efforts. It is critical to be able to identify and counter them.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1)
14. History and Trends of Conflict	Addresses how and why leaders decide whether to fight or seek a peaceful resolution to a conflict and how leaders base their decisions on whether and how to utilize violence on a multi-dimensional cost-benefit analysis involving economic concerns, strategic concerns, and identity concerns. Whether leaders believe that their survival depends on the destruction of rival groups.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1)

BPC Foundational Skills	Description	Relevant CMT Competencies
15. Assessment	Assessment is the continuous process of monitoring and evaluation of the current situation and progress of an operation. Assessment provides the context for determining institutional, operational and human capacity in order to determine achievement of objectives. Training would include the Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments (MPICE) Metrics Framework that provides a system of metrics that can assist in formulating policy and implementing strategic and operational plans to transform conflict and bring stability to war-torn societies. These metrics provide the content for baseline operational and strategic-level assessments allowing policymakers to diagnose potential obstacles to stabilization prior to an intervention. The principal purpose is to enable practitioners to track progress from the point of intervention through stabilization and, ultimately, to a self-sustaining peace.	Understands the cultural context of situations (C1)

Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals (C11) |
| 16. Mediation | Identify the objectives and methods of third-party engagement in peacemaking in interstate or intrastate conflicts with focus on building competence for practicing mediation and situating mediation in the larger peace-building context. | Applies available resources and expertise (C12)

Manages conflict (C8) |
| 17. Transferring Knowledge | Although Soldiers are experienced in their own craft, they often are not trained in teaching, and particularly not teaching to adults. Addresses the process of teaching a skill, imparting relevant knowledge, and proposing a way forward to a foreign counterpart. | None |
| 18. Information Disclosure to non-U.S. Forces | Develop understanding of the regulations that apply to proper disclosure of information to non-U.S. forces. Addresses security requirements associated with identifying and protecting organizational information assets, performing the analysis techniques used in risk management, and recognizing the responsibilities associated with different roles in an organization. | Manages the flow of communication (C9) |

BPC Foundational Skills	Description	Relevant CMT Competencies
19.Actors, Dynamics, Issues	The various actors involved in post conflict environments are key to any effort. Addresses their interests, the relationships and the interactions they have with the international intervention, the local government, and the population that will impact the ability of any actor interested in stabilization, reconstruction, and reform to be effective. Soldiers should understand the interests and positions of these various actors, understand how to identify them, and how to engage them.	Understands multiple perspectives (C3) Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4) Establishes effective partnerships and teams (C5) Develops positive relationships (C6) Builds common ground and shared purpose (C7)
20.Threat Vulnerability Assessment	This training is designed to introduce and further develop the concept of threat and vulnerability assessment to include Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear and Enhanced Conventional Weapons (CBRNE) threats, vulnerabilities, protection plan analysis, DOD capabilities, prioritization, management, and coordination.	None
21.Fundamentals of BPC	Introduces the idea of building partnership capacity through transferring knowledge. Addresses the concept of capacity, how to identify it and the challenges that one faces when identifying and strengthening capacity in reform efforts. Addresses methods to recognize opportunities to lay the ground work for effective partnership with local partners.	Understands multiple perspectives (C3) Understands capabilities of partners and systems (C4) Establishes effective partnerships and teams (C5) Develops positive relationships (C6) Builds common ground and shared purpose (C7) Manages conflict (C8) Applies available resources and expertise (C12)

Army Leadership Competencies (Field Manual 6-22). Depiction of the relationship between the CMO competencies and competencies included in Field Manual 6-22 (Headquarters Department of the Army, October, 2006).

FM 6-22 Core Competency		Associated Components and Actions
Leads	Leads Others	Provide purpose, motivation, inspiration Enforce Standards Balance mission and welfare of Soldiers
	Extends Influence Beyond the Chain of Command	Build trust outside lines of authority Understand sphere, means, and limits of influence Negotiate, build consensus, resolve conflict
	Leads by Example	Display character Lead with confidence in adverse conditions Demonstrate competence
	Communicates	Listen actively State goals for action Ensure shared understanding
Develops	Creates a Positive Environment	Set the conditions for positive climate Build teamwork and cohesion Encourage initiative Demonstrate care for people
	Prepares Self	Be prepared for expected and unexpected challenges Expand knowledge Maintain self-awareness
	Develops Others	Assess developmental needs. Develop on the job Support professional and personal growth Help people learn Counsel, coach, and mentor Build team skills and processes
Achieves	Gets Results	Provide direction, guidance, priorities Develop and execute plans Accomplish tasks consistently

Notional addition to competency model: The "Collaborates" row in this table depicts the CMO competencies and demonstrates how the competencies could fit with the existing leadership competencies in Field Manual 6-22 (Headquarters Department of the Army, October, 2006).

Collaborates	Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures	Understand the cultural context of situations Assess new cultural environments and adjust appropriately Understand multiple perspectives
	Builds Partnering Relationships	Understand capabilities of partners and systems Develop positive relationships Build common ground and shared purpose
	Collaborates to Solve Problems	Use integrative methods for planning and problem solving Synchronize tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals Apply available resources and expertise

Appendix H

Training Review Tool

Instructions for Review of Training Courses

Overview

The purpose of this toolkit is to provide instructions for conducting a detailed review of courses offered at your institution/facility that cover material related to civil-military teaming (CMT). Specifically, the review will serve as a gap analysis and help you to identify which CMT competencies are, or are not, currently captured in individual courses in your training and education system.

Instructions

1. Using Table 1 on the next page, list a course offered by your organization that provides training or instruction in the domain of, or relevant to, CMT.
2. In the spaces provided, supply the information requested about the course.
3. If you have any additional comments or notes about the program/course, please provide them in the space indicated.

Your task in this review is to indicate from a list of previously identified competencies, which subset is covered by the course(s) offered at your organization. The list of competencies and their definitions is shown in Table 2. The nine competencies are organized according to three meta-competencies: (1) Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures, (2) Builds Partnering Relationships, and (3) Collaborates to Solve Problems. The competency model was developed from a review of relevant military and civilian literatures as well as interviews with subject matter experts. Each competency describes different combinations of knowledge, skills, and abilities needed for successful performance in situations calling for CMT.

4. Familiarize yourself with the list of competencies by reviewing the labels and associated definitions presented in Table 2.
5. For the program/course you listed in Table 1, please indicate in Table 3 which competencies are covered by that offering. We would like you to do so by making <u>two</u> separate ratings:

   1. To what extent is this competency required for successful performance during this course?
   2. To what extent do the lessons in this course provide training/education to improve this competency?

6. Please use the following scale to make your ratings (NOTE: rate all competencies for one question before moving onto ratings for the second question):

   1 = Not at all
   2 = Minor extent
   3 = Somewhat
   4 = Considerable extent
   5 = Great extent

The materials in this packet were developed as a template and can be used to review one course at a time. They can be used to review additional courses as needed.

Table 1

Organization:	
Course Name:	
Brief Description:	
Elements of Course Relevant to CMT:	
Course Learning Objectives:	
Instructional Methods:	
Number of Classroom/Self-Study Hours:	
Requirements for Course Completion:	
Please provide additional comments about the course here:	

Table 2

Civil-Military Competency Model with Behavioral Definitions

Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures	
Understands the cultural context of situations	• Understands the situation within its historical, regional, and cultural (national or organizational) context. • Keeps up-to-date on local, national, and international policies and trends that affect own organization and shape stakeholders' views.
Assesses new cultural environments and adjusts appropriately (cultural agility)	• Displays insight into cultural impacts and perceptions when pursuing operational objectives. • Rapidly adapts to ambiguous or emerging conditions, opportunities, risks, new information, or unexpected obstacles, demonstrating a willingness to adapt as the situation dictates. • Is able to assess the environment and acquire new or more effective behaviors as context and roles change. • Is reflective and demonstrates awareness of biases (both personal and belonging to own organization). • Can turn observations and insights into course corrections in dynamic time.
Understands multiple perspectives	• Is able to shift own perspective to see situations from other people's points of view. • Recognizes which aspects of different issues or situations are relevant to each party in order to understand, predict, and influence behavior. • Is aware of how own organization is perceived by other organizations/entities, and anticipates how various actions and decisions will be interpreted by others. • Keeps in check own tendency to interpret others' decisions and actions based on own experiences, beliefs, assumptions, and value system.

Builds Partnering Relationships	
Understands capabilities of partners and systems	• Demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the actors within the operation and key partnerships. • Is familiar with different organizational power structures, communication styles, technologies, and metrics, and understands their potential impact on goal focus, information sharing, planning, and decision-making. • Understands organizational dynamics at the conceptual and applied levels. • Comprehends the interdependencies between systems, decisions, organizations, etc., and the tools that support their management.
Establishes effective partnerships and teams	• Facilitates cohesion and cooperation, and motivates partners/team members to accomplish joint goals. • Facilitates teamwork across organizational boundaries by fostering team commitment, spirit, pride, trust, and a climate of openness. • Accommodates a variety of interpersonal styles and perspectives in order to partner effectively, achieve objectives, and remove barriers. • Understands team capabilities and dynamics in order to identify and leverage expertise. • Breaks down polarizing or stove-piped perspectives within and across organizational boundaries. • Develops networks, establishes alliances, and collaborates effectively across boundaries to build strategic relationships and achieve common goals.
Develops positive relationships	• Is willing to engage and cultivate relationships with people who may be very different from self. • Develops and leverages a diverse range of key relationships to build bridges across institutional divides and improve access to resources and expertise. • Considers and responds appropriately to the needs and feelings of different people in different situations. • Actively listens and responds to others while demonstrating an understanding of their comments and questions.

Adapts Across Organizations and Cultures	
Builds common ground and shared purpose	• Establishes and maintains common ground as a basis for creating shared purpose, and achieving mutually sought goals and unity of effort. • Explores and articulates alternatives to develop the best ideas, obtain resources, elicit commitment and/or agreement, and accomplish mutually important goals. • Facilitates processes and outcomes that are mutually acceptable to all involved parties. • Considers underlying consequences for key stakeholders while seeking and negotiating win/win solutions.
Manages conflict	• Manages and resolves individual and organizational conflicts and disagreements in a constructive manner to achieve a unified effort both internal and external to the team. • Anticipates and takes steps to prevent counterproductive confrontations. • Defines barriers and mediates differences to reach acceptable and viable solutions.
Manages the flow of communication	• Recognizes that organizations differ in their information needs, priorities, and sense of willingness and/or urgency for information sharing. • Understands and respects that methods, technologies, and channels of communication differ across organizations and situations (e.g., method of presentation, who shares information, how authority for information sharing is managed, how complete information must be to support decisions). • Communicates effectively with broad audiences and external organizations, tailoring communication to a level appropriate for the intended audience and inspiring the acceptance of ideas requiring collaboration among diverse partners. • Conveys and describes facts or ideas in a clear, logical, and comprehensive manner both orally and in writing. • Fosters an atmosphere of open communication by encouraging others to share differing perspectives.

Collaborates to Solve Problems	
Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving	• Recognizes that problems are multifaceted and understands how different parts of a problem relate to each other, as well as the different perspectives and needs that problem-solving partners contribute. • Develops and shares problem-solving methodologies that serve to reconcile competing viewpoints while remaining focused on the goals at hand. • Supports iterative problem-solving in the absence of perfect solutions. • Collaborates effectively in 'virtual' as well as face to face environments • Demonstrates the capacity to lead, plan, manage, or participate in a supporting role with individuals from foreign nations as well as with interagency counterparts, members of other services, and NGOs, in spite of differences in national/institutional cultures and processes.
Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals	• Demonstrates the ability to harmonize tactical planning with operational objectives and strategic goals, accounting for the consequences of decisions and/or actions over time and across multiple levels and lines of operations. • Sees the big picture and understands implications of 2nd & 3rd order effects of plans and actions for own as well as partner organizations. • Formulates objectives and priorities, and implements plans in conjunction with the efforts of many people, organizations, and communities. • Capitalizes on opportunities and manages risks.
Applies available resources and expertise	• Identifies the resources and expertise in own and other organizations/entities needed to address common goals. • Demonstrates the ability to cooperatively acquire and administer human, financial, material, and information resources to accomplish the mission. • Matches assets to the appropriate problems, not just those that are most salient to own organization. • Develops workarounds where resources are constrained or barriers to access exist. • Understands own boundaries for action and manages expectations accordingly.

Table 3

Competency Ratings for Course/Program Under Review

Course Name:											
CMT Competencies*	Use this Scale:	**Competency Ratings:** 1 = Not at all 2 = Minor extent 3 = Somewhat 4 = Considerable extent 5 = Great extent									
	1. To what extent is this competency required for successful performance during this course?					*Gap?*	*2. To what extent do the lessons in this course provide training/education to improve this competency?*				*Gap?*
Understands the cultural context of situations	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
Assesses new cultural environments and adjusts appropriately (Cultural agility)	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
Understands multiple perspectives	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
Understands capabilities of partners and systems	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
Establishes effective partnerships and teams	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
Develops positive relationships	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
Builds common ground and shared purpose	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	

Manages conflict	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
Manages the flow of communication	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
Uses integrative methods for planning and problem-solving	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
Synchronizes tactical actions, operational objectives, and strategic goals	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	
Applies available resources and expertise	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	

Note: Refer to Table 2 for full behavioral descriptions of the CMT competencies.

Guidance for Reviewing the Ratings

Once you have completed your ratings, take a look at them as a set: do there appear to be any gaps in competency coverage? Which competencies did you give a rating of three or less? Identify these competencies by marking a '✓' in the gap column for each rating.

Are you surprised by the number and/or type of competencies that appear to be gaps? Do the gaps make sense based on course content?

For the competencies you rated *Not at all*, *Minor Extent*, or *Somewhat*, it is worth considering whether it is within the purview of the course to augment training in those specific areas. This may not make sense and/or be feasible in all cases. However, identifying which competencies are not currently represented in a particular course (in terms of either being required for successful performance or being directly trained) may highlight specific areas for improvement or expansion. Incorporating an under-represented competency in a course could involve such changes as adding training or feedback to an existing element of the course or adding a new unit or module.

Based on your review of Table 3, identify up to five CMT competencies that signify potential gaps in the training represented by the course under review. Identify 1-3 ideas for ways to augment the existing training to incorporate the competency in question.

Competency	Ideas to Augment Training
1.	1. 2. 3.
2.	1. 2. 3.
3.	1. 2. 3.
4.	1. 2. 3.
5.	1. 2. 3.